

works intended to convey water to the land embraced in his entry he is, without fault on his part, unable to make proof of the reclamation and cultivation of said lands, as required by law, within the time limited therefor but such extension shall not be granted for a period of more than three years, and this act shall not affect contests initiated for a valid existing reason.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I understand the only effect of this bill will be to give certain claimants a longer time in which to perfect their claims and get their patents.

Mr. JONES. If they make a satisfactory showing to the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. If they make a satisfactory showing.

Mr. SHAFROTH. How much longer does it grant them?

Mr. JONES. Three years.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. JONES, the title was amended so as to read: "A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to grant further extensions of time within which to make proof on desert-land entries in the counties of Grant and Franklin, State of Washington."

HOMESTEAD ENTRIES FOR MINORS.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, since it is yet some minutes of 6 o'clock, I wonder if I may not call the attention of Senators to Senate bill No. 2419? I do so, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Dakota asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a bill the title of which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 2419) permitting male minors of the age of 18 years or over to make homestead entry or other entry of the public lands of the United States.

The Senate, by unanimous consent, proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands with amendments, in section 1, page 1, line 6, before the word "minor," to strike out "male," and on page 2, line 4, after the word "he," to insert "or she," so as to make the section read:

That in all cases wherein persons of the age of 21 years or over are now permitted to make homestead entry or other entry of lands under the public-land laws of the United States any minor of the age of 18 years or over and otherwise qualified under such laws shall be permitted to make such entry, subject to all the provisions of such laws in regard to residence upon and improvement and cultivation of such lands: *Provided, however,* That no minor shall be eligible to make final homestead proof and receive a homestead patent for any such lands until at least 14 months after having attained the age of 21 years, nor eligible to make final proof or receive patent on other than a homestead entry until he or she has attained the age of 21 years.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill permitting minors of the age of 18 years or over to make homestead entry or other entry of the public lands of the United States."

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. BACON. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After eight minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 5 o'clock and 53 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, August 22, 1913, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate August 21, 1913.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY.

Edwin Lowry Humes, of Pennsylvania, to be United States attorney for the western district of Pennsylvania, vice John H. Jordan, whose term has expired.

REGISTER OF THE LAND OFFICE.

A. F. Browns, of Sterling, Colo., to be register of the land office at Sterling, vice William H. Pound, term expired.

PROMOTION IN THE ARMY.

QUARTERMASTER CORPS.

Maj. Herbert M. Lord, Quartermaster Corps, to be lieutenant colonel from March 4, 1913, vice Lieut. Col. Beecher B. Ray, whose recess appointment expired by constitutional limitation March 3, 1913.

PROMOTIONS AND APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY.

Passed Asst. Surg. Charles C. Grieve to be a surgeon in the Navy from the 22d day of January, 1913.

The following-named citizens to be assistant surgeons in the Medical Reserve Corps of the Navy from the 13th day of August, 1913:

Guthrie McConnell, a citizen of Pennsylvania, and

Howard A. Tribou, a citizen of Maine.

Carpenter Joel A. Davis to be a chief carpenter in the Navy from the 19th day of April, 1913.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate August 21, 1913.

GOVERNOR GENERAL OF THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.

Francis Burton Harrison to be Governor General of the Philippine Islands.

POSTMASTERS.

NEBRASKA.

Andrew B. Anderson, Florence.

J. E. Scott, Osmond.

Orren Slote, Litchfield.

Rainard B. Wahlquist, Hastings.

NORTH DAKOTA.

Frank J. Callahan, McClusky.

Andrew D. Cochrane, York.

James J. Dougherty, Park River.

P. J. Filbin, Steele.

Charles E. Harding, Churchs Ferry.

Carl Jahnke, New Salem.

Robert A. Long, Drayton.

J. H. McLean, Hannah.

W. T. Reilly, Milton.

RHODE ISLAND.

Thomas H. Galvin, East Greenwich.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, August 22, 1913.

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

GOODS IN BOND (S. DOC. NO. 166).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communication, which was read:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, August 21, 1913.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE.

SIR: In compliance with a resolution of the Senate of the 1st instant, requesting for the use of the Senate certain information relative to goods remaining in warehouse without the payment of duty August 1, 1912, and August 1, 1913, I have the honor to advise you that the values and duties requested are as follows:

Value of merchandise in warehouse Aug. 1, 1912.....	\$71,561,698
Duty on same under present tariff.....	40,767,828
Value of merchandise in warehouse Aug. 1, 1913.....	104,576,937
Duty on same under present tariff.....	58,256,272
Estimated duty under H. R. 3321 on merchandise in warehouse Aug. 1, 1913.....	48,499,214

Respectfully,

JOHN SKELTON WILLIAMS,
Acting Secretary.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The communication is in response to a resolution introduced by the Senator from Utah [Mr. SUTHERLAND]. What does the Senator desire to have done with the communication?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I suggest that it be printed and lie on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The communication will be printed and lie on the table.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JONES:

A bill (S. 3021) granting an increase of pension to Christina Nicholes; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. O'GORMAN:

A bill (S. 3022) to remove the charge of desertion against Edward Burke; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

AMENDMENTS TO THE TARIFF BILL.

Mr. PENROSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 3321) to reduce tariff duties and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 3321) to reduce tariff duties and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

THE TARIFF AND THE WOOLEN INDUSTRY (S. DOC. NO. 167).

Mr. PENROSE. I should like to make a request for the printing as a document of an article relating to the tariff bill. I have here an article headed "The tariff and the woolen industry," by Prof. Thomas Walker Page, professor in the University of Virginia, originally printed in the Quarterly Bulletin of the National Association of Wool Manufacturers for June, 1913. This gentleman was a member of the Tariff Board, the Democratic member. A similar production of his relating to the duty on wool was printed as a House document, and I thought this companion article would be of interest to the Senate. It is short. [After a pause.] At the request of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS] I will suspend my request until he has had a chance to examine the article.

Mr. THOMAS. I should like to inquire of the Senator from Pennsylvania if the article by Mr. Page already printed is the same as that published in the April number of the North American Review?

Mr. PENROSE. What is the title of the article in the North American Review?

Mr. THOMAS. "Our wool duties."

Mr. PENROSE. That article, I understand, was printed by order of the House as a public document. This article refers to the duties on the manufactures of wool.

Mr. THOMAS. My question had reference to the document already printed.

Mr. PENROSE. This article has not been printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. At the request of the Senator from Pennsylvania, the matter will lie over for the present.

Mr. PENROSE subsequently said: Mr. President, this morning I asked for the printing as a document of an article by Prof. Thomas Walker Page, entitled "The tariff and the woolen industry." At the request of the chairman of the Finance Committee I delayed the request until he had an opportunity to examine the article, which he has done. He informs me that while he can not agree with the contents of it, he will not object to its publication. Therefore I renew my request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey in the chair). Does the Senator desire the article read?

Mr. PENROSE. No; I do not desire it read. I desire to have it printed as a document. I wish to advise the Senate that this gentleman was the Democratic member of the Tariff Board and is now connected with the University of Virginia. He went through all the study of the wool, cotton, and other schedules. He wrote a similar article on the duty on wool, which was published as a House document. It seemed only proper to me that this article should also be published as an accompanying document.

I suppose the reason the Senator from North Carolina does not concur in the views of the professor is that while he was supposed to be a minority member of the board, the evidence which he saw as the result of his elaborate investigations almost persuaded him that a duty on woolen manufactures was necessary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the article will be printed as a public document.

ARTICLE BY HON. ELIHU ROOT (S. DOC. NO. 168).

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I ask to have printed as a public document an article by Hon. ELIHU ROOT published in the current issues of the North American Review for the months of July and August, 1913, on "Experiments in Government and the Essentials of the Constitution."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE TARIFF.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The morning business is closed.

Mr. SIMMONS. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed with the consideration of House bill 3321.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3321) to reduce tariff duties and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President—

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Borah	Bristow	Catron
Bacon	Brady	Bryan	Chamberlain
Bankhead	Brandeggee	Burton	Chilton

Clapp	Lewis	Ransdell	Stone
Colt	Lippitt	Robinson	Sutherland
Fall	Lodge	Shafroth	Swanson
Fletcher	McLean	Sheppard	Thomas
Gallinger	Martin, Va.	Sherman	Thompson
Gronna	Martine, N. J.	Shields	Tillman
James	Norris	Shively	Townsend
Jones	O'Gorman	Simmons	Vardaman
Kenyon	Page	Smith, Ariz.	Walsh
Kern	Penrose	Smith, Ga.	Warren
La Follette	Perkins	Smith, S. C.	Weeks
Lane	Pittman	Smoot	Williams
Lea	Pomerene	Sterling	

Mr. JAMES. My colleague [Mr. BRADLEY] is detained from presence here by reason of illness. He has a general pair with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. KERN]. I will allow this announcement to stand for the day.

Mr. SHEPPARD. My colleague [Mr. CULBERSON] is necessarily absent. He is paired with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT]. This announcement will stand for the day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-three Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, a few days ago I wandered over to the other side of this Chamber to make a friendly call on a distinguished old-time friend of mine, a Democratic Senator. Hearing that he intended to address the Senate on that day, I asked him if he was going to talk. He said, "No." I asked him why he and those with him did not talk; why they did not explain the tariff bill now before us, and defend some of its provisions. He replied smilingly and very promptly, and with tumultuous robustness, "We don't have to talk. We have the votes."

Well, I frankly acknowledged the corn and passed on. But, Mr. President, it occurred to me to ask how they came by those votes; how the minority-elected President and the few minority-elected Senators who completed the Democratic majority received the votes which caused this great robustness of reply to questions of that kind. Did they receive those votes on promises made to the people, and were those promises made to the people in line with what they now propose to do in this tariff bill? Let us see.

Mr. KERN. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. WARREN. I do.

Mr. KERN. I should like to inquire of the Senator whether it has not been repeatedly charged in this debate from the Republican side that the Democratic Senators in the discussion of this bill have occupied more time than the Republican Senators, and whether complaint was not made because of that?

Mr. WARREN. Does the Senator admit that?

Mr. KERN. I am making the inquiry of the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. WARREN. I have not charged that, and I do not know that I heard that charge made.

Mr. KERN. It has been made repeatedly.

Mr. WARREN. What is the Senator's opinion about that?

Mr. KERN. My opinion is that a very large part of the time has been consumed by Democratic Senators in the discussion of this measure. It has been fully discussed in every phase by them, as the RECORD will show. I repeat, complaint has been made repeatedly from the other side that Democratic Senators have delayed the bill by reason of their talking on it more than the Republican Senators.

Mr. WARREN. I presume the Senator is correct about that, but I assume he will not ask me to secure an affidavit that I did receive the reply which I mentioned.

Mr. KERN. Oh, no; I do not ask the Senator to procure an affidavit. I think he was taking seriously a playful remark made by a Senator.

Mr. WARREN. I will say seriously in this connection that they certainly have not talked too much to suit me. I would rather have heard more from the other side.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me the opportunity, I will say that I think it is conceded on both sides of the Chamber that neither our Democratic friends nor the Republicans have unduly delayed the consideration of the bill. The debate has been a legitimate debate, and it has pleased me to have our Democratic friends participate in it to the extent they have done.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. WARREN. I do.

Mr. SIMMONS. All I desire to say about this matter is that while I agree with the Senator from New Hampshire that the debate has been legitimate on both sides, I do think that our Republican friends have shown a good deal of inconsistency in their statements.

Mr. WARREN. I should think—

Mr. SIMMONS. Pardon me a minute. At one time they twit us with consuming more time in the discussion than they have consumed, and they produce statements made up from the Record to show that we have consumed a good deal of the time that has been taken in the debate. At another time they twit us with a conspiracy of silence. I have not been able to determine whether the other side of the Chamber meant to charge us with talking too much or with talking too little.

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator will permit me, the conspiracy of silence suggestion came from me when the Senator from North Carolina solemnly stated to the Senate that the other side of the Chamber had concluded not to talk, and I regretted that they appeared to have entered into an arrangement of that kind.

Mr. STONE. I think we are talking to very little purpose now, Mr. President.

Mr. SIMMONS. If that had been the only time when the Senator from New Hampshire used that expression it might have been pardonable, because I did state on that occasion that we were so anxious to make headway that day we had not talked, although some Senators on this side had desired to speak. But that was not the first time we had heard from the other side the suggestion that there was a conspiracy of silence on this side, followed by the suggestion that we are taking up more time than the other side.

Mr. WARREN. May I ask the Senator from North Carolina, would he not think a great deal less of us on this side if from his standpoint we were not inconsistent with the views he has expressed during this tariff debate?

Mr. SIMMONS. I would think that the Republican Party was not consistent; I would think the Republican Party had changed its spots.

Mr. WARREN. That is a frank concession perhaps. I want to ask one question, however, before the Senator leaves the floor. Does the Senator think that either side of this Chamber has been guilty of any filibustering on the tariff bill?

Mr. SIMMONS. I have stated repeatedly that I had made no such charge as that.

Mr. WARREN. I thank the Senator, because that has been charged, I think.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. WARREN. With pleasure.

Mr. THOMAS. I promise not to interrupt the Senator again; but I should like to inquire whether the Senator's view of public duty contemplates that Senators should carry out in legislation the pledges and promises of their party platform?

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I think they should; and I was just about to proceed along a line that will give my views and an answer to the Senator's question.

Mr. THOMAS. I merely wanted to ascertain whether that was the Senator's view.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, the Democratic national convention, held at Baltimore in 1912, declared in its platform the following:

We recognize that our system of tariff taxation is intimately connected with the business of the country, and we favor the ultimate attainment of the principles we advocate by legislation that will not injure or destroy legitimate industry.

Mr. President, wool growing is a legitimate industry; perhaps none more so in this world.

The Democratic candidate for the presidency, Mr. Wilson, announced in his speech at Pittsburgh:

The Democratic Party does not propose free trade or anything approaching free trade. It proposes merely a reconsideration of the tariff schedules, such as will adjust them to the actual business conditions and interests of the country.

But, Mr. President, the Democratic Party does propose absolute free trade for wool—a farmer's product of great importance. It not only approaches free trade, but actually and immediately accomplishes it so far as the farmer's finished product, wool, is concerned.

DEMOCRATIC ANTE-ELECTION PLEDGES BROKEN.

And thus are the ante-election pledges of party and presidential candidate broken, and the farmers—the flower of American citizenship—outrageously sinned against.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], a frank, outspoken, and prominent member of the Finance Committee which has charge of the tariff bill now before us, maintains stoutly that he does not claim the purpose of the bill to be, throughout, a tariff for revenue only. He says:

Any tariff bill must necessarily, confronted with the conditions with which we are now confronted, involve a certain degree of protection,

and whether you call it protection for itself or protection incidentally makes no difference.

I have never said, and do not propose to say, that this bill is clear through, from beginning to end, a tariff for revenue only. All I have said is that it goes as far in that direction as we are to go without—being confronted as we are with actual conditions—destroying men who have been put by the Government in a position where they must be ruined or else gradually permitted to come down. If a man is a hundred feet high, you can go up and let him down gradually, but if you go up and thereby pitch him down you will kill him.

And yet, Mr. President, the dominant party has selected for absolute slaughter the woolgrowing industry, and does not propose to let it down gradually by a partial removal of the tariff.

The wool industry is a highly protected one, and the men engaged in it are in the class which the Senator from Mississippi aptly described as those "who have been put by the Government in a position where they must be ruined or else gradually permitted to come down," and surely should be counted among those whom he would "let down gradually" if he would not kill them.

The Government not only provides protection in the way of a tariff, but on the other side of the equation it charges the flockmaster an extortionate price for grazing in the National forests and upon the public domain, and thus absorbs a great percentage of the returns. This proposed tariff law does not relieve the woolgrower from this grazing burden.

The distinguished junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH], in speaking of the farmer, says:

I admit that the reduction on the things that he buys has not gone as far as I want it to go. I am perfectly frank about that. But our industries have purchased their machinery in markets that have added 50 per cent in many instances to a fair price for the machinery. We have cut that one-half. I hope it will be cut again before a great while. I hope that we will really bring the entire tariff to a revenue basis in the course of time.

Again, the Senator from Georgia says:

I have recognized existing conditions. I have felt that we could not afford to go as far as I would like to see the law go, lest serious injury would affect those industries in view of the position they have occupied in the past.

Still further, the Senator from Georgia says:

You could not levy a tax on a commodity produced here for revenue purposes only that might not bring some incidental protection. You could not levy a tax here the sole object of which was revenue on certain classes of goods that would not in a measure incidentally produce protection.

The Senator from Georgia speaks wisely, and I commend him. He would permit at least incidental protection, because some industries have purchased their machinery, and so forth, in protected markets, and this "would affect those industries in view of the position they have occupied in the past."

Following this theory the woolgrower is clearly subject to the exceptions that the Senator from Georgia would make, for his plant and everything he has in the business has been purchased in a protected market.

Wool has been continuously on the dutiable list since 1816, excepting the three or four years under the Wilson-Gorman Act. Hence American-grown wool has been protected more or less throughout over 95 years of the life of the Republic, while the manufactures of wool have been protected for 124 years. The American people are the greatest consumers of wool per capita in the world, and during these years the Government has received large revenues in the way of duties upon imported wool, the difference between the amount grown here and the amount manufactured.

Although the tariff on wool has been changed nearly a score of times during the period named, nevertheless wool has been dutiable under the administration and management of all political parties which have controlled our Government during the past almost 100 years.

Indeed, the Confederacy during its reign in the South also gave its adherence to a protective tariff on wool.

WOOLGROWING ANCIENT AND HONORABLE INDUSTRY.

The woolgrowing industry has always been deemed not only an ancient but one of the most honorable of all avocations; yet it is to be stricken down, notwithstanding the promises and assertions made from highest authority in the Democratic Party that while reduction in duties must be made, free trade or anything approaching free trade would not be proposed. An attempt is sometimes made to justify this slaughter by the weak insinuation that woolgrowing is not a legitimate industry. Well, if not, why not? As to honor and legitimacy, there is not a flaw. It is an industry in which a man can succeed only by the sweat of his face, hard labor, close economy, and industrious application of all of his faculties, mental and physical. No trusts nor combinations in woolgrowing. No watered stock nor paper profits to be imposed upon the public. Only hard, close "digging," seven long days in every week of every month in every year.

No millionaires or even semimillionaires are counted among flockmasters who have accumulated their fortunes in sheep raising and woolgrowing alone, although many, many men have turned all or a portion of their incomes from other sources into the development of the industry.

The wool industry, Mr. President, dates back to the days of Adam and the world's creation. The Bible makes many references to the industry, and always in commendation of it. Some of the most beautiful psalms and metaphorical and parabolical allusions in the Bible are based upon sheep, shepherds, and wool. "The Lord is my shepherd, I shall not want," introduces one of the most beautiful series of verses in the world's literature. The Book of Genesis tells us that the younger son of Adam, "Abel was a keeper of sheep." Cain, his elder brother, wickedly slew Abel after a colloquy over the firstlings of his flock. Has it now come to pass that the Democratic Party, our older and stronger brother, is to slay us, the Republican Party, because we would protect the flockmaster? And will the end be as of old, that the countenance of the Lord shall be turned away from the slayer because of cruelty to the slain? We shall, of course, be duly and surely advised of this in time—probably in the two even-numbered years next following the present year, 1913.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, will my friend permit me? The Senator makes this Scriptural quotation: "The Lord is my shepherd; I shall not want." It seems to me that he perverts the real meaning of that text and misuses it. The Senator should have paraphrased the text and said something like this: "A high protective tariff is my shepherd, and, so long as it prevails, I shall not want." [Laughter.]

Mr. WARREN. I wish the Senator might go on with his interpretation of the Bible in that same strain.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEA in the chair). Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. WARREN. I do.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I have heard the distinguished Senator from Wyoming designated as "the greatest shepherd since the days of Father Abraham." I suppose we should pay homage to him and hope to gain our aid and succor—revising the Biblical quotation for these latter days—from the shepherd of to-day, the shepherd from Wyoming.

Mr. WARREN. Do I still have the Senator's love, cooperation, confidence, and respect?

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Indeed, the Senator always has my respect. A man who can command so magnificent a personal presence, and a man who by his genius has been able to gather around him such a colossal herd as he now has roaming the plains of the western part of our country, indeed will command the respect of almost every one of his fellow citizens.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator from New Jersey always carries out the teachings of the Bible. I congratulate and thank him.

Christopher Columbus brought sheep over with him in his second voyage of discovery, and we have ransacked the world ever since to obtain different strains for importation and improvement.

Has it, then, remained for this day and date and for our friends on the other side, the Democrats, to uncover the illegitimacy of this venerable and honorable industry? If so, why? How? With what proof?

GROWTH OF SHEEP AND WOOL INDUSTRY.

Sometimes it is said by the uninformed and the "opposed-on-general-principles" that the industry is dying out; that the numbers of sheep are decreasing, and so forth.

As to the number of sheep in the United States, we of course consult the census reports, investigations by the Department of Agriculture, market reports where wool and mutton are sold, and such other publications as are authentic.

A free-wool exponent, on the Senate floor a few days since, stated, with seeming indifference, perhaps, that in 1900 there were in the United States 61,503,713 sheep, while in 1910 there were only 52,447,861. These figures he perhaps took from the United States census report, but he did not take the pains to add the explanation given officially in that report immediately after the figures, as follows:

The total number of sheep reported as on farms and ranges on April 15, 1910, was 52,448,000, as compared with 61,604,000 on June 1, 1900, a decrease of 9,056,000, or 14.7 per cent. This decrease, however, is due partly to the change in the date of enumeration. Many lambs are born during the interval between April 15 and June 1. Furthermore, on many ranches in the West the lambs are not definitely

counted so early in the year as April 15, and it seems likely that in some such cases ranchmen failed to make any estimate of the lambs.

In view of the fact that, even after making necessary allowances, as discussed below, the number of ewes 1 year of age or over on June 1, 1911, was probably less than 1,000,000 short of the number on the same date in 1900, it seems likely that if the enumeration of 1910 had been made as of June 1 there would have been nearly as many lambs less than 1 year old as were reported 10 years before. * * *

The number of ewes was reported in 1910 as 31,934,000 and in 1900 as 31,858,000, there being thus nominally a slight increase.

It is admitted both by the Department of Agriculture and the Census Bureau that errors may creep into the annual computation of the number of sheep in the country from the very nature of things, prepared as they are by different persons under different administrations and under different rules and regulations, like the instance just cited, wherein one census was taken in April before the lambing season and the other one in June after the lambing season, it being well understood that nearly all of the lambs in the woolgrowing section are dropped during the months of April and May.

Relating to this, I submit the following letter from the Department of Agriculture:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
BUREAU OF STATISTICS,
Washington, D. C., August 18, 1913.

HON. FRANCIS E. WARREN,
United States Senate.

SIR: I have been requested by your secretary to explain how the figures relating to the number and value of sheep on farms in the United States, appearing on pages 691-692 of the 1912 Yearbook of the Department of Agriculture, were obtained.

The bases of the figures relating to numbers are the census returns as published on page 677 of the Yearbook. The Department of Agriculture's figures are estimates, not enumerations. Starting with any census year as a base, it estimates the percentage of increase or decrease in each succeeding year. Such percentages are obtained from voluntary correspondents and field agents of the Bureau of Statistics. Whenever a new census is taken the new census figures are adopted as a base for applying such percentages; there is, therefore, a readjustment every 10 years. In making the readjustments in 1901 and 1911 the census figures, which included lambs with sheep, were used as the base. The earlier census figures, I believe, did not include lambs.

The values per head are obtained by combining the average price per head of sheep under 1 year old, of ewes 1 year old and over, and of rams and wethers 1 year old and over, the relative importance of each class being considered in the combination. The estimates of average value per head are obtained from voluntary correspondents and field agents of the Bureau of Statistics.

Respectfully,

NAT C. MURRAY,
Acting Chief of Bureau.

That accounts for the great jump from 1901 and 1902, because before that time the annual crop of lambs was not counted, while after that time it was counted.

The Department of Commerce reports the following regarding the matter:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
BUREAU OF STATISTICS,
Washington, August 20, 1913.

HON. FRANCIS E. WARREN,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Complying with the request made by your secretary, I take pleasure in furnishing you with a statement pertaining to the comparability of statistics pertaining to sheep for 1910 and 1900. The reports of the Census Bureau show that the total number of sheep reported as on farms and ranges on April 15, 1910, was 52,448,000, as compared with 61,504,000 on June 1, 1900, a decrease of 9,056,000, or 14.7 per cent. This decrease, however, is largely due to the change in the date of enumeration. In 1900 a law enacted by Congress provided for the enumeration to be made as of June 1, whereas a law which provided for the census of 1910 specified that the date of enumeration should be as of April 15. Any person acquainted with the live-stock industry would immediately notice the difference in date and be satisfied in their own mind that inasmuch as many lambs are born during the interval between April 15 and June 1 a large part of the decrease must be definitely charged to the fact that most of the spring lambs had not yet been born.

If we eliminate from consideration lambs at both censuses, we find that the number of ewes reported in 1910 is 31,934,000 and in 1900 is 31,858,000, there being thus, nominally, a slight increase. It is very likely, however, that between April 15 and June 1 a considerable number of these ewes would have died or would have been sold. It is practically impossible to estimate the number which would thus have disappeared. It is also necessary to call attention to the fact that because of the change in date a slight change was made in the classification at the two censuses. This would practically result in further slight decreases, but it is clear that the decreases during the decade must have been comparatively small.

In the case of rams and wethers the statistics show that 7,995,000 were reported in 1900, as compared with 7,710,000 in 1910, thus showing a slight decrease in this class. In the case of rams and wethers, however, the number to be deducted from the returns of 1910, on account of slaughter between April 15 and June 1, would be relatively greater than in the case of ewes, so that had the date of enumeration and the method of classification been the same at the two censuses a considerably greater decrease would have appeared than is shown in the table. This decrease, even though it amounted to 10 or 12 per cent, would be comparatively small considering the entire sheep industry, because at the date of taking the census, when lambs are eliminated from consideration, nearly 80 per cent of the entire number of sheep are classed as ewes. * * *

Very truly, yours,

JOHN LEE COULTER,
Expert Special Agent, in Charge of Division of Agriculture.

Therefore a slight decrease, and only a slight one, occurred during that last decade.

But, Mr. President, there are far better and more practical ways to obtain the facts relative to the importance and value of the sheep industry: First, by accounting for the wool product, which is all duly weighed and goes into consumption; and second, by the statistics showing the amount of mutton shipped to market.

The total clip of wool in the States in 1912 was 304,043,400 pounds.

There have been only six years during the entire history of our country's wool production in which the amount shown by these figures has been reached, and two of these years immediately preceded 1912.

The largest clip ever produced was in 1909, which amounted to 328,110,749 pounds.

I submit herewith, Mr. President, the following figures taken from Government statistical reports, to show the increased growth of the wool crop and its increasing value from 1899 to date:

Some comparisons in wool production.

Wool produced in 1899	pounds	276,568,000
Value		\$45,670,000
Wool produced in 1909	pounds	289,420,000
Value		\$65,472,000
Wool produced in 1912	pounds	304,043,400
Value		\$75,819,251
Increase in production, 1899 to 1909	per cent.	4.6
Increase in value, 1899 to 1909	do	43.4
Increase in production, 1909 to 1912	do	5
Increase in value, 1909 to 1912	do	16
Increase in production, 1899 to 1912	do	10
Increase in value, 1899 to 1912	do	66

Figures for 1899 and 1909, Statistical Abstract 1912 (p. 164).
Figures for 1912, Statistical Abstract (p. 162).

RISE AND FALL IN NUMBERS OF SHEEP.

To students of the sheep industry the annual counts of sheep and of the wool and mutton product, taken together, have demonstrated very clearly that the number of sheep and the wool product diminish under an inadequate tariff, real or threatened. In all cases where the tariff has been reduced the numbers have decreased, although in some instances in years when sheep have decreased in numbers the wool has increased in volume, the reason for this being that after the flockmasters have sheared their sheep, if an undue number are then sent to the shambles, there is added to the regular wool clip the pulled wool from the skins of the slaughtered animals—the later growth of the same year.

For instance, the number of sheep reached the highest point ever known, up to that time, on January 1, 1884—50,626,626; but it is significant that although the count was more than a million higher on January 1, 1884, than on January 1, 1883, yet the total value in 1884 was over five and a half million dollars lower than the total value in 1883.

Looking at the total yield of wool in 1884-85, we find that the amount reached 308,000,000 pounds, which was also a higher figure than ever reached before that time or in any year after that time until 1895, and, with that one exception, higher than any year up to 1902. The reason of this was that in 1883 legislation was enacted, which went into effect in 1884, reducing the tariff on wool materially. The number of sheep immediately commenced receding until, in 1889, the shrinkage amounted to over 8,000,000 head, and the total wool product shrank 43,000,000 pounds, or to a total of 265,000,000 pounds.

Proceeding to the next high mark in wool, which occurred in 1893, we find that sheep had increased to 47,273,553 head, and the value had increased from \$90,500,000 to \$126,000,000, and the wool had risen in volume to 303,153,000 pounds, this following legislation reducing the tariff. In 1894 wool was made free, and the sliding downward again proceeded until, in the beginning of 1897, sheep had decreased in numbers to 36,818,543, worth but \$67,020,942.

Then came the return of protection to wool and woolsens, and the number of sheep increased from less than 37,000,000, worth only about \$67,000,000, with a wool product of only 259,153,251 pounds, in 1897, to nearly 60,000,000 sheep, worth over \$200,000,000, yielding over 300,000,000 pounds of wool and up to as high as 328,000,000 pounds, during the undisturbed, unthreatened existence of the Dingley tariff act.

It is true that after the election of 1910 the Democratic control of the House of Representatives and the introduction of bills there for the reduction of the tariff took place, the number of sheep and the quantity of the wool clip decreased to some extent, although this decrease was not all due to the reasons I have just given, but partially due to two dry summers and an exceedingly hard winter—the worst one in the history of the plains country in a number of the western heavy wool-producing States.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. WARREN. I do.

Mr. WALSH. Will not the distinguished Senator from Wyoming add to the causes enumerated the absorption of the range by settlers?

Mr. WARREN. That is entirely true as to certain localities. I will add it.

Mr. WALSH. Will not the Senator agree, also, that as a matter of fact it is the prime cause of the reduction in the last three years?

Mr. WARREN. I will agree to that as to one or two States, or possibly three; but in some of the other States they have increased, and would have increased more except for what I have already stated.

Mr. WALSH. Will the Senator indicate to us some western State in which that condition has not been operative?

Mr. WARREN. I will instance my own State, which has vibrated both ways. Owing to one of the reasons I have given, the hard winter, our sheep greatly decreased, as did also the settlement of the country. In the meantime, however, the wool clip of last year was nearly 3,000,000 pounds more than the year before, showing the partial return in the States that raise less wool. Lands that were not before used for sheep have been turned over to that purpose.

Mr. WALSH. I am interrupting the Senator simply for information. I assumed, as a matter of course, that the settlement of his State was abbreviating the range, and necessarily reducing the number of sheep.

Mr. WARREN. It is in certain localities, as the Senator has stated.

Mr. WALSH. I should be surprised to learn from the Senator that his State was an exception in that regard.

Mr. WARREN. It is not an exception, as the department states; but I say, as a net result, we had more last year than the year before.

Mr. President, the woolgrowers and wool manufacturers have been sometimes in harmony and often in hostility. After long-continued differences a common ground was arrived at in 1863, which, with some unimportant exceptions, continued until 1883, when the reduction in tariff heretofore mentioned was made and differences occurred between the wool growers and Secretary Hayes, of the Wool Manufacturers' Association. Fairly friendly relationship was restored, however, through the passage of the McKinley bill, having been cemented to some extent, perhaps, by the unfortunate rulings of the Treasury Department a little earlier, during Mr. Cleveland's administration, which both growers and manufacturers considered burdensome and unfair, because such rulings partially nullified the import duties on tops, broken tops, wastes, and so forth, and permitted for a time the importation of these commodities nearly equivalent to that of free wool and free partially manufactured goods.

The distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] in his able speech submitted some figures and conclusions, quoted from the Agricultural Yearbook, showing very considerable shrinkages in the number of sheep during four recent years. I do not charge the Senator with an intention to mislead; but when the figures he quoted are considered in the light of the explanation offered by the Census Bureau, which I have heretofore quoted, and in the light of the letters from the Department of Agriculture and the Census Bureau, also heretofore quoted, it is clearly seen that, through the changes in time and manner of taking the counts, and because of the growing tendency of the past few years on the part of flockmasters to dispose of all of their wether lambs and many of their ewe lambs in the fall of the year when they are but a few months old and before they are counted for the census, the real situation differs materially from the apparent in that we have maintained almost the full figure in number of sheep of shearing age. And this also accounts for and is proved by the continued large wool clip. In substantiation of this I offer the following:

Some comparisons in sheep numbers.

In 1899:		
Total sheep	61,503,713	
Less lambs	21,650,746	
	39,852,967	
In 1909:		
Total sheep	52,447,861	
Less lambs	12,803,815	
	39,644,046	
In 1912:		
Total sheep	52,362,000	
Less lambs	13,881,000	
	38,481,000	
Shearing age		

So the real difference in numbers varies only a trifle over one and a quarter million head.

Value all sheep in 1899	\$170,203,119
Value all sheep in 1909	232,841,585
Value all sheep in 1912	181,170,000
Increase in value 1899 to 1909	per cent. 36
Decrease in value 1909 to 1912	do. 27
Increase in value 1899 to 1912	do. 6.4

See Census Bulletin, Agriculture, p. 22, and Agriculture Yearbook, 1912, pp. 691-692.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me at this point to interrogate him?

Mr. WARREN. Certainly.

Mr. PENROSE. Has the Senator any figures showing the number of sheep on the so-called ranges of the West, or in the country, say, west of the Mississippi River, and the smaller flocks east of the Mississippi River, or in the eastern part of the country, on farms?

Mr. WARREN. I have not included that, nor have I it here at hand just now. I have it in mind, however, and at my committee room.

Mr. PENROSE. The idea I had in asking the question was to bring out the thought that the growing of wool is not confined to being a western industry.

Mr. WARREN. Not at all.

Mr. PENROSE. The people of Pennsylvania have a very live interest in woolgrowing; and at one time the county of Washington, I think, led all other counties in the United States in the growing of wool.

Mr. WARREN. That is quite true; and it will astonish a great many people, if they will pick up the statistics, to find that while it goes up and down, a great many States are at times increasing and at others decreasing. I had occasion to go before a meeting of manufacturers to make a speech at one time. At that time I checked up every State in the Union, and there were only two States east of the Mississippi River that had not increased their number of sheep in the two years immediately before the time I made the computation.

Mr. PENROSE. The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA] has handed me the figures I had in mind, and I will ask to have them put in the Record later on.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I have before me the figures asked for by the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PENROSE. I have them here. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I have here a computation made for me by painstaking parties, which I carefully checked at the time and part of which I used in some remarks made in the Senate four years ago. I have added thereto such figures as will bring the computation down to date. At this point in my remarks I ask that the table referred to be inserted.

It is a table giving the history of wool ever since we commenced taking the census in 1840. It gives the production of our domestic wool; the amount, if any, exported; the amount that went into consumption. It also gives the imports and exports of foreign wool, that coming over and that going back. It gives the foreign importation retained for consumption, the total wool consumption of the United States, and the percentage used of foreign and of home wool in that consumption. The table referred to follows.

Table showing United States product, imports, etc., of wool.

WOOL PRODUCED, IMPORTED, EXPORTED, AND RETAINED FOR CONSUMPTION: QUANTITIES, 1840, 1850, 1860, AND FROM 1864 TO 1912.¹

Year ended June 30—	Production. ²	Exports of domestic.	Domestic retained for consumption.	Imports.	Exports of foreign.	Foreign retained for consumption.	Total consumption, domestic and foreign.	Per cent of consumption, foreign.
	Pounds.	Pounds.	Pounds.	Pounds.	Pounds.	Pounds.	Pounds.	
1840 ³	35,802,114		35,802,114	9,898,740	85,528	9,813,212	45,615,326	21.5
1850	52,516,959	35,898	52,481,061	18,695,294		18,695,294	71,176,355	26.3
1860	60,264,913	1,055,928	59,208,985	26,282,955	157,064	26,125,891	85,334,876	30.6
1864	123,000,000	155,482	122,844,518	91,250,114	223,475	91,026,639	213,871,157	42.6
1865	142,000,000	466,182	141,533,818	44,420,375	679,281	43,741,094	185,274,912	23.6
1866	155,000,000	973,075	154,026,925	71,287,988	852,045	70,435,943	224,462,868	31.0
1867	160,000,000	307,418	159,692,582	38,158,382	619,614	37,538,768	197,231,350	19.0
1868	168,000,000	558,435	167,441,565	25,467,336	2,801,852	22,665,484	190,107,049	11.9
1869	180,000,000	444,387	179,555,613	39,275,926	342,417	38,933,509	218,489,122	17.8
1870	182,000,000	152,892	181,847,108	49,230,199	1,710,053	47,520,146	209,367,254	22.7
1871	180,000,000	25,195	159,974,805	68,058,028	1,305,311	66,752,717	226,727,522	29.4
1872	160,000,000	140,515	149,859,485	126,507,409	2,343,937	124,163,472	274,022,957	45.3
1873	158,000,000	75,129	157,924,871	85,496,049	7,040,386	78,455,063	236,380,534	33.2
1874	170,000,000	819,600	169,180,400	42,939,541	6,816,157	36,123,384	205,803,784	17.5
1875	181,000,000	178,034	180,821,966	54,901,760	3,567,627	51,334,133	232,156,099	22.1
1876	192,000,000	104,768	191,895,232	44,642,836	1,518,426	43,124,410	235,019,642	18.3
1877	200,000,000	79,599	199,920,401	42,171,192	3,088,957	39,082,235	239,002,636	16.3
1878	203,250,000	347,854	202,902,146	48,449,079	5,952,221	42,496,858	250,399,004	16.9
1879	211,000,000	60,784	210,939,216	39,005,155	4,104,616	34,900,539	245,839,755	14.2
1880	232,500,000	191,551	232,308,449	128,131,747	3,648,520	124,483,227	356,791,676	34.9
1881	240,000,000	71,455	239,928,545	55,964,236	5,507,534	50,456,702	290,385,247	17.3
1882	272,000,000	116,179	271,883,821	67,861,744	3,831,836	64,029,908	335,913,729	19.0
1883	290,000,000	64,474	289,935,526	70,575,478	4,010,043	66,565,435	356,500,961	18.7
1884	300,000,000	10,393	299,989,607	78,350,651	2,304,701	76,045,950	375,035,557	20.6
1885	308,000,000	88,006	307,911,994	70,596,170	3,115,339	67,480,831	375,392,825	18.0
1886	302,000,000	147,023	301,852,977	129,084,958	6,534,426	122,550,532	424,403,609	28.9
1887	285,000,000	257,940	284,742,060	114,038,030	6,728,292	107,309,738	392,051,798	27.4
1888	269,000,000	22,164	268,977,836	113,558,753	4,359,731	109,199,022	378,176,858	28.9
1889	265,000,000	141,576	264,858,424	126,487,729	3,263,094	123,224,635	388,083,059	31.8
1890	276,000,000	231,042	275,768,958	105,431,285	3,288,467	102,142,818	377,911,776	27.0
1891	285,000,000	291,922	284,708,078	129,308,648	2,638,123	126,665,525	411,373,603	30.8
1892	294,000,000	202,456	293,797,544	148,670,652	3,007,563	145,663,089	439,460,633	33.1
1893	303,153,000	91,858	303,061,142	172,433,838	4,218,637	168,215,201	471,276,343	35.7
1894	298,057,384	520,247	297,537,137	55,152,685	5,977,407	49,175,178	346,712,315	14.2
1895	309,748,000	4,279,109	305,468,891	206,033,906	2,343,081	203,690,825	509,159,716	40.0
1896	272,474,708	6,945,981	265,528,727	230,911,473	6,026,236	224,885,237	490,413,964	45.9
1897	259,153,251	5,271,535	253,881,716	350,852,026	3,427,834	347,424,192	601,305,908	57.8
1898	266,720,684	121,139	266,599,545	132,795,202	2,504,832	130,290,370	396,889,915	32.8
1899	272,191,330	1,083,419	271,107,911	76,736,209	12,411,916	64,324,293	334,832,204	19.2
1900	288,636,621	2,200,309	286,436,312	155,928,455	5,702,251	150,226,204	436,662,516	34.4
1901	302,502,328	199,565	302,302,763	103,583,505	3,590,592	99,993,003	402,295,766	24.9
1902	316,341,632	123,278	316,217,754	166,576,968	3,104,663	163,472,305	479,690,057	34.1
1903	287,450,000	618,919	286,831,081	177,137,796	2,992,995	174,144,801	461,075,882	37.8
1904	291,783,032	319,750	291,463,282	173,742,534	2,893,053	170,849,781	462,343,063	37.0
1905	295,488,438	123,951	295,364,487	249,135,746	2,437,687	246,698,049	542,062,536	45.5
1906	298,915,130	192,481	298,722,649	201,688,608	5,450,378	196,238,230	494,960,939	39.6
1907	298,294,750	214,840	298,079,910	203,847,545	3,231,908	200,615,637	498,695,547	40.0
1908	311,138,321	182,458	310,955,863	125,980,524	5,084,537	120,906,167	431,252,030	27.9
1909	328,110,749	28,576	327,882,173	206,408,304	3,495,599	202,912,705	530,794,878	44.7
1910	321,362,759	47,520	321,315,239	263,928,232	4,007,953	259,920,279	581,235,509	44.5
1911	318,547,900		318,547,900	137,647,641	8,205,699	129,441,942	447,989,842	28.9
1912	304,043,400		304,043,400	193,400,713	1,719,870	191,680,843	495,724,243	38.7

¹ Does not include data with respect to commerce between the United States and its insular possessions after June 30, 1900.

² From estimates of the Department of Agriculture prior to 1896; from 1896 to date estimated by the secretary of the National Association of Wool Manufacturers.

³ Year ended Sept. 30.

Table showing number and value of sheep in the United States.
[Sheep not enumerated prior to 1840.]

January 1—	Number.	Value.
1840.....	19,311,374	
1850.....	21,773,220	
1860.....	22,471,275	
1867.....	39,385,386	
1868.....	38,991,912	\$98,407,809
1869.....	37,724,279	82,139,979
1870.....	40,853,000	93,364,433
1871.....	31,851,000	74,035,837
1872.....	31,679,300	88,771,197
1873.....	33,002,400	97,922,350
1874.....	33,928,200	88,690,569
1875.....	33,783,600	94,320,652
1876.....	35,935,300	93,666,318
1877.....	35,804,200	80,892,683
1878.....	35,740,500	80,603,062
1879.....	38,123,800	79,023,984
1880.....	40,765,900	90,230,537
1881.....	43,576,899	104,070,759
1882.....	45,016,224	106,594,954
1883.....	49,237,291	124,365,835
1884.....	50,626,626	119,902,706
1885.....	50,360,243	107,960,650
1886.....	48,322,331	92,443,867
1887.....	44,759,314	89,872,839
1888.....	44,544,755	89,279,926
1889.....	42,599,079	90,640,369
1890.....	44,336,072	100,659,761
1891.....	43,421,136	108,397,447
1892.....	44,938,365	116,121,290
1893.....	47,273,553	125,909,264
1894.....	45,048,017	89,186,110
1895.....	42,294,064	66,685,767
1896.....	38,298,783	65,167,735
1897.....	36,818,643	67,020,942
1898.....	37,650,960	92,721,133
1899.....	39,114,453	107,097,530
1900.....	41,883,065	122,665,913
1901.....	59,756,718	178,072,476
1902.....	62,039,091	164,446,091
1903.....	63,964,876	168,815,750
1904.....	51,630,144	133,530,099
1905.....	45,170,423	127,331,850
1906.....	50,631,619	179,056,144
1907.....	53,240,282	204,210,129
1908.....	54,631,000	211,736,000
1909.....	56,084,000	192,632,000
1910.....	57,216,000	233,664,000
1911.....	53,633,000	209,535,000
1912.....	52,362,000	181,170,000
1913.....	51,482,000	202,779,000

The jump in numbers from 1900 to 1901, 1902, and 1903 was on account of adding the lambs to the count of sheep of shearing age.

THE MUTTON PRODUCT.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] submitted some statements and figures relating to the mutton product, as follows:

Our sheep have been going, in numbers increasing annually, to the slaughtering pens, the Crop Reporter for February, 1913, giving the following numbers absorbed by the principal stock markets. In—

1909.....	10,284,905
1910.....	12,406,767
1911.....	13,556,108
1912.....	13,743,843

As stated earlier in my remarks, the tendency of late years on the part of flockmasters has been to ship their surplus stock at an earlier age than formerly, and hence lambs are sent to the slaughtering pens at the end of their first summer. In this way the large losses from wintering lambs are avoided, and the product actually delivered in numbers to market can be substantially increased without really weakening the breeding and wool-producing flocks.

And so this increase of over 30 per cent in shipments to market during the last four years has not decreased in any like proportion the number of sheep of shearing age or the annual wool product. It simply shows that we are raising proportionately more lambs.

Apropos the quotation referring to the slaughtering pens, the records show that during the last 30 years the United States has, like England and some other countries, become a great consumer of mutton.

Mutton is not only one of the most healthful and palatable of foods, but its supply and consumption have greatly assisted in maintaining our meat supply so necessary to the creation and preservation of the brain and brawn of our citizens.

Except for the large mutton supply, the price of cattle and hog products would undoubtedly have been far and away in excess of even the present prices.

History informs us that in this vicinity and nearby, in early times, when a slave owner hired out his slaves under contract it was quite usual for the bond or contract to stipulate that such slaves during their period of employment should not be

compelled to eat terrapin or canvasback duck more than twice in any one week. With terrapin now costing from \$1 to \$2.50 per portion and canvasback duck from \$2.50 to \$5 apiece, difference in prices because of a great increase in population and a decrease in meat supply is painfully evident.

Mr. President, shall we crush out our sheep growers with a free-trade policy, and when they have ceased their efforts and engaged in other pursuits shall we depend upon foreign shipments of frozen meat at terrapin and canvasback duck prices? It is true that we did not in time properly protect the sea food and fowl just mentioned, but it is also true that we are now endeavoring to cover up lost ground by the establishment of Government terrapin farms, as instanced by those in Maine and Carolina, and by suitable game laws as to the wild game birds.

In order to be altogether independent of foreign powers in war and peace, we must depend upon home production of wool. Wool, a contraband, is almost as necessary to our soldiers and citizens as are guns, powder, and bullets, and we should be indeed lost without it in a long-continued struggle in our northern climes.

NONE BENEFITED BY FREE WOOL.

Mr. President, if I were convinced that a majority of this Congress honestly believe that placing wool on the free list of this proposed law will be for the best interests of this country; if I were convinced that the majority honestly believe that the people will get better clothing, or as good clothing at a substantially lower cost, than they have been getting under the present tariff, I would acquiesce in the change without a protest, for I am willing, as I think every man is who reveres law and order, to undergo personal sacrifices if thereby the welfare of the many may be promoted.

But I am satisfied that no one will receive any substantial benefits from placing wool on the free list, for we have before us the examples of the removal of the tariff from coffee and from hides; the one, coffee, many years ago, and coffee has steadily gone higher and is higher now than ever before; and, later on, hides, which gave us no cheaper leather or shoes. These facts are notorious, and are examples of what we may expect.

A reasonable and substantial reduction in the tariff rates on wool and wool manufactures could be made without driving to the wall either industry. But I submit that this invidious distinction of singling out wool alone to reduce immediately from high tariff rate to no tariff rate at all seems to me most uncalled-for, cruel, and unwise.

Indeed, it looks to me like tariff for politics only instead of tariff for revenue only.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. WARREN. I do.

Mr. PITTMAN. I should like to understand the Senator with regard to his illustration of free hides. Do I understand him to draw the comparison to show that free wool will not reduce the price of raw wool?

Mr. WARREN. I did not make that observation. The object, I understand, if any, in reducing the tariff is to relieve the consumer. Am I right about that?

Mr. PITTMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. WARREN. Very well. I contend that it will not relieve the consumer, the wearer of clothes, in any great degree. There is no more reason to expect it than there was that the removal of the tariff on hides would reduce the price of shoes. We tried that experiment.

Mr. PITTMAN. Did the removal of the tariff on hides reduce the price of hides?

Mr. WARREN. Did it?

Mr. PITTMAN. Yes. I am asking that question of the Senator.

Mr. WARREN. Immediately when the duty was removed, foreign countries—that is, Argentina—in fact, before the bill was signed, effected one rise in price. After it was signed they made another, which nearly absorbed the difference. Later on, of course, the price of hides receded. But from causes upon which the raw material has but little effect, shoe manufacturers have not been able to lower, at least they have not lowered, their prices.

Mr. PITTMAN. The question I ask is, Has the reduction of the tariff on hides generally reduced the price of hides?

Mr. WARREN. It did finally.

Mr. PITTMAN. It has finally reduced it?

Mr. WARREN. Yes; if the Senator wishes to draw the comparison as to whether this will reduce the price of wool to the grower, there is no question but that it will very materially reduce it to the grower, but in my judgment there is no ques-

tion as to the wearers of clothes that they will pay practically the same prices, because the raw wool that goes into a suit of clothes is so infinitesimal, the amount of the tariff is so small that it will cut no figure. It will be absorbed after the wool-grower, and between him and the consumer, the same as to all other commodities from which we have removed the tariff, such as coffee, hides, and so forth.

Now, if it so be that the American people go out of the raising of wool and we are dependent upon a foreign market, we may expect, perhaps, as high prices again, or probably higher prices upon wool and mutton eventually after our flocks are gone and our flockmasters engaged in other pursuits.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. WARREN. I do.

Mr. SMOOT. The question whether the ultimate consumer will receive cheaper clothing or not I think can be answered by a statement which was made by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN] yesterday. In his speech upon wool yesterday he called the attention of the Senate to the fact that the price of scoured wool in this country upon a certain day was 42 cents, as I remember, and in England it was 46 cents.

Mr. PITTMAN. No, that is a mistake.

Mr. SMOOT. Making a difference of 4 cents on scoured wool.

Mr. PITTMAN. I wish to correct the Senator. I said that the average cost at a certain period of time in England was about 42 cents while the average cost in this country of various grades of wool was approximately 48 cents.

Mr. SMOOT. That is just as good a statement for me in order to make a comparison on.

Mr. PITTMAN. Except that the Senator had it just reversed.

Mr. SMOOT. I reversed the figures.

Mr. President, the Senator says that there is a difference of only 5 cents on the average price of scoured wool in England and the United States. It takes of scoured wool to make a suit of clothes 11 1/2 any of us have on not to exceed 3 1/2 pounds. Three and one-half pounds at 5 cents, which the Senator names, makes a difference of 17 1/2 cents upon a suit of clothes. Does the Senator believe that the ultimate consumer is going to get that 17 1/2 cents? The wholesaler sells perhaps a \$20 suit of clothes for \$11. Does the Senator believe that the retailer is going to sell that \$20 suit of clothes for \$19.82 1/2? He never will do it. The price will be \$20 for the suit of clothes.

Mr. WARREN. I have some figures which I have not reached; I shall reach them soon, but I do not wish to cut off other Senators.

Mr. PITTMAN. May I answer the Senator from Utah?

Mr. WARREN. Certainly.

Mr. PITTMAN. The Republican Party have been contending that the manufacturer had to pay the woolgrower the extra amount of the duty, and therefore he has retained that much extra duty on his manufactured article, thereby adding to his manufactured article. In selling it to the wholesaler he has figured it in the price to the wholesaler, and the wholesaler has figured that in the price to the retailer, and the retailer has figured that in the price to his customer.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, there is where the Senator is mistaken.

Mr. PITTMAN. But wait a minute. If there is a difference of only 5 cents in the price of scoured wool in England and in this country, then it goes to show that this country does not need any protection on raw wool.

Mr. SMOOT. I want the Senator to understand that the figures I have here do not correspond with the figures he quoted yesterday.

Mr. PITTMAN. I am answering the Senator's argument. And one other thing. No matter whether it amounts to 5 cents a suit or \$5 a suit, there is no legitimate reason why the consumer should be required to pay even 5 cents more than the legitimate cost of an article for the purpose of delivering a bonus to anyone else.

Mr. SMOOT. What I wish to say, Mr. President, is that neither the Senator from Nevada nor anyone else nor Congress can regulate the charges of the retailer to the ultimate consumer. The great trouble is with the costly distribution of goods in this country. It is not with the raiser of the wool; it is not with the manufacturer. I tell the Senator now that there is not a manufacturer of woolen goods in this country who would not be delighted to run his mill from one year's end to the other if he could make from 5 to 7 1/2 cents a pound upon those goods. At 5 cents a yard, with 3 1/2 yards to a suit, 17 1/2 cents would be his profit upon the suit.

Mr. PITTMAN. Is it not a fact that the more he pays for the raw wool the more he must have to charge to make that 7 1/2 cents?

Mr. WARREN. I am just going into that very argument, and while I do not wish to cut off anybody else, at a later time in my remarks I should be very glad if the Senator wants to go into it.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. WARREN. I do.

Mr. WALSH. With the Senator's permission I should like to ask the Senator a question. I beg to assure him that I am not going to inject an argument into the midst of his interesting address.

Mr. WARREN. I shall be delighted to hear the Senator.

Mr. WALSH. The last observation of the Senator from Wyoming, however, excites my very keen interest. It was to the effect, as I understood him, that in the opinion of the Senator a reduction in the duties on wool and woolen goods might very properly be made, but in the opinion of the Senator the reduction that is here made is too drastic; it goes too far.

Mr. WARREN. It is not a matter of reduction at all; it is a matter of the removal of the duty.

Mr. WALSH. An abolition of the duty. The Senator coupled it with woolen manufacture?

Mr. WARREN. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. I should like to inquire of the Senator when it was that he reached the conclusion that a reduction of the duties on wool might properly be made.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, in the operation of the ordinary man's brain it seldom comes like a flash of lightning upon him if he should change his opinion. So I do not know that I would be able to state at what time. I simply stated here that undoubtedly, at present with the manufacturers in the status they are, with the improved machinery, and so forth, and with the prices, they could sustain some reduction, both manufacturers and woolgrowers, but a total striking out of the duty on wool at one fell swoop, when we were not given any reason to expect it, and when the Senator's party had never said they intended it in their campaign last fall, is what I am complaining about.

Mr. WALSH. I did not care for any accuracy in point of time. But as a matter of course I have followed the discussion in which the Senator has often participated upon this schedule with a great deal of interest, and this is the first time, according to my recollection, I have ever heard the Senator advance upon this floor, or ever heard of his having advanced on this floor, the idea that the duties ought to be reduced. Consequently, it was a matter of considerable interest to me. If I labor under—

Mr. WARREN. I hope the Senator will not misquote me. What I said was that a reasonable and substantial reduction of the tariff rates on wool could be made without driving to the wall either industry.

Mr. WALSH. Do I understand the Senator to take the position to-day that the duties ought not to be reduced at all?

Mr. WARREN. I do not take that position at all. I take no position now about that except what I have said. The Senator misquoted me, of course, accidentally.

Mr. WALSH. I certainly did not intend to misquote the Senator. I should, however, like clearly to understand the position of the Senator now if he will kindly inform us as to what his attitude is.

Mr. WARREN. Will the Senator vote with me upon a partial rate? Will he vote with me for any tariff on wool? He has formerly supported earnestly a tariff on wool. Has he changed his mind?

Mr. WALSH. I have not any assurance yet as to how the Senator will vote.

Mr. WARREN. I do not know that it is time to announce what I expect might be done on that question until the Senator is ready to say what he would do.

Mr. WALSH. I will say I shall make no bargain with anybody.

Mr. WARREN. Well, Mr. President, from his own judgment, if it were not that it is a part of a large number of items in the tariff bill, would the Senator advocate the immediate free-wool standard?

Mr. WALSH. I asked the Senator a question and have not had any answer yet.

Mr. WARREN. I was trying to get a little information from one of superior judgment, who evidently has changed his mind about what should be the tariff on wool.

I know it is claimed that placing a duty on wool passes the duty up along through the stages of manufacture to the consumer. Well, for the sake of argument, allowing that to be true, what does it signify? And why not the item of protection afforded the farmer, when his portion amounts simply to pen-

nies instead of dollars from each suit of clothes? Why not his small share of only a fraction of a dollar on each ordinary suit of clothes? Why not the farmer, when you protect at every step from the farmer upward, and everybody connected with the wool industry from farm to consumer's back except the grower of the product? The wool is first made into tops, and upon them you have a duty. It then goes into yarns, and there again you have a duty. From there to cloths—under a duty, of course. Then through the dealers' hands, who attach their profit, into the wholesale clothiers' establishments—and they, too, are protected. Then out to the wholesale dealers and retail dealers, all of whom have their profits. Why should the farmer—the one who works the hardest throughout, the most hours, and for the least money—be the only one to have nothing at all in the line of protection for his industry, while the moment the product of his industry leaves his hands it is protected at every turn? And, indeed, he himself, in buying back his own farm-grown wool in the clothing necessary for himself and his family, has all of these duties to pay. Where is the logic? Where is the justice—the decency, even—in such invidious distinction?

I do not inveigh against the manufacturer's protection, but against leaving the farmer with no protection at all for his finished product, while his purchase of items with which to produce that product, and for his living expenses, must be made in a protected market.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] and those who believe with him seem to forget that the woolgrower's investment has been made and that his business is now standing upon the same basis as that of manufacturers and others who have purchased machinery, and so forth, in a protected market. As a matter of fact, the farmer's business is in more need of protection along this line than most of the other industries. Everything which he uses on the farm and about it, and indeed the farm itself, was bought in a protected market. His sheep were bought in a protected market and reared under expenses of labor and supplies, tools, implements, etc., all in the protected market which the Senator mentions.

Thus the woolgrower is most grievously hurt and must bear a burden from which manufacturers have been in part relieved by a retention of a part of their protective tariff.

BRIEF HISTORY OF WOOLGROWING.

The history of the woolgrowing industry has been told, written, and published many times, and it is not my intention at this time to go extensively into its details and rehearse what "you, yourselves, do know." It will be neither untimely nor out of place, however, to allude briefly to past events which mark the history of the industry in this country. The latest is the effect the proposed annihilation of protection on wool has had on the industry during the present year.

The wool clip of the State of Wyoming for the present year, estimated conservatively, amounts to over 30,000,000 pounds. The general condition of the wool markets of the world outside the United States should warrant the ready sale of the crop at an average price of 19 cents a pound. But the disruption of trade brought about by the impending elimination of the tariff on wool and woolsens has made it impossible to dispose of but a portion of the year's production, and the average price realized has been around 14 cents per pound. The direct loss to the woolgrowers of the State of Wyoming in the one season through this expected legislation is two millions of dollars. The wool clip of the entire country for the present year, conservatively estimated, is 300,000,000 pounds, and the direct loss to the wool-raising farmers of the country in the one year by reason of the free-trade features of this bill as they affect wool, amounts to nearly or quite twenty millions of dollars on wool alone, to say nothing of the tremendous loss in value of sheep, land, and so forth.

This immense sum is lost to the producers, and the sorrow of it is that it will not benefit the consumer. No man nor woman buying a piece of woollen goods to-day can get it any cheaper on account of tariff agitation or prospective free trade, but every pound of wool going into these goods brought the grower 5 to 8 cents a pound less than it would had there been no radical change proposed in the tariff on wool or if the free-trade sword of Damocles had not been hanging over the industry since November last.

The woolgrowing business has been one of paradoxes, in that it has not always been what it seemed. When natural conditions appeared to favor growth and prosperity in the business, it has occasionally languished; and sometimes, though not often, it has improved in the face of adversity. It should have a bright future in store for it; but, regardless of what should be its fate, it may be annihilated and those engaged in it may be forced to follow the advice of Senators who have told the

woolgrowers, as they have told the sugar-cane growers, to get into some other business.

The growth of the woolgrowing business has been marked by many complexities growing out of changing conditions of agriculture in the various sections of the country; the competition of foreign products, and of domestic products also; the climatic extremes which one season may have been favorable and the next disastrous to the industry; but most of all by the vagaries of the National Legislature in dealing with that product.

The history of our national legislation in relation to wool from the beginning of our present form of government for at least 75 years is a record of almost unexplainable changes in tariff rates.

I submit at this point a table showing the tariff duties on wool from 1789 to 1909.

The tariff duties on wool, 1789-1909.

Date of act of Congress.	Date of tariff.	Rates of duty.
July 4, 1789	July 4, 1789	Free.
Apr. 27, 1816	July 1, 1816	15 per cent ad valorem.
May 22, 1824	July 1, 1824	Value not exceeding 10 cents a pound, 15 per cent; value exceeding 10 cents a pound, 20 per cent; after June 1, 1825, 25 per cent; after June 1, 1826, 30 per cent.
May 19, 1828	July 1, 1828	4 cents a pound and 40 per cent, the ad valorem rate to be 45 per cent from July 1, 1829, and 50 per cent from July 1, 1830.
July 14, 1832	Mar. 3, 1833	Value not over 8 cents a pound, free; value over 8 cents a pound, 4 cents a pound and 40 per cent ad valorem.
Mar. 2, 1833	Jan. 1, 1834	Duties of the preceding act in excess of 20 per cent to have one-tenth of such excess taken off every 2 years till Jan. 1, 1842, when one half the residue to be deducted, and the remaining half after June 30, 1842.
Aug. 30, 1842	Aug. 30, 1842	Value not over 7 cents a pound, 5 per cent; value over 7 cents a pound, 3 cents a pound and 80 per cent.
July 30, 1846	Dec. 1, 1846	30 per cent ad valorem.
Mar. 3, 1857	July 1, 1857	Value not over 20 cents a pound, free; value over 20 cents a pound, 24 per cent.
Mar. 2, 1861	Apr. 1, 1861	Value less than 18 cents a pound, 5 per cent; value 18 cents and not over 24 cents a pound, 3 cents a pound; value over 24 cents a pound, 9 cents a pound.
June 30, 1864	July 1, 1864	Value 12 cents or less a pound, 3 cents a pound; value over 12 cents a pound and not over 24 cents, 6 cents a pound; value over 24 cents a pound and not over 32 cents, 10 cents a pound and 10 per cent ad valorem; value over 32 cents a pound, 12 cents a pound and 10 per cent ad valorem.
Mar. 2, 1867	Mar. 2, 1867	Class I, clothing wool, value 32 cents a pound or less, 10 cents a pound and 11 per cent ad valorem; value over 32 cents a pound, 12 cents a pound and 10 per cent ad valorem; washed wool, twice the regular duty. Class II, combing wool, value 32 cents a pound or less, 10 cents a pound and 11 per cent ad valorem; value over 32 cents a pound, 12 cents a pound and 10 per cent ad valorem. Class III, carpet wool, value 12 cents a pound or less, 3 cents a pound; value over 12 cents a pound, 6 cents a pound. All classes, scoured wool, treble the regular duty.
June 6, 1872	Aug. 1, 1872	All duties reduced 10 per cent.
Mar. 3, 1875	Mar. 3, 1875	Duties of act of Mar. 2, 1867, restored.
Mar. 3, 1883	July 1, 1883	Class I, clothing wool, value 30 cents a pound or less, 10 cents a pound; value over 30 cents a pound, 12 cents a pound; washed wool, double the regular duty. Class II, combing wool, value 30 cents a pound or less, 10 cents a pound; value over 30 cents a pound, 12 cents a pound. Class III, carpet wool, value 12 cents a pound or less, 2½ cents a pound; value over 12 cents a pound, 5 cents a pound. All classes, scoured wool, treble the regular duty.
Oct. 1, 1890	Oct. 6, 1890	Class I, clothing wool, 11 cents a pound; if washed, double the regular duty. Class II, combing wool, 12 cents a pound. Class III, carpet wool, value 13 cents a pound or less, 32 per cent; value over 13 cents a pound, 50 per cent. All classes scoured wool, treble the regular duty.
Aug. 1, 1894	Aug. 28, 1894	Free.
July 24, 1897	July 24, 1897	Class I, clothing wool, 11 cents a pound; if washed, double the regular duty. Class II, combing wool, 12 cents a pound. Class III, carpet wool, value 12 cents a pound or less, 4 cents a pound; value over 12 cents a pound, 7 cents a pound. All classes scoured wool, treble the regular duty.

(See Wright's Woolgrowing and the Tariff, pp. 344-346.)

WOOLGROWING IN COLONIAL TIMES.

At the close of our colonial and the outset of our national history we had no defined woolgrowing industry, sheep raising being but a small part of the general farm production of each farmer. Most of the farmers raised a few coarse-wool sheep for home manufacture of coarse clothing; and aside from a very few fine flocks, one of them owned by President Washington, there were no flocks of any considerable size, and the country depended upon England for its woolsens.

The fact that there was no home wool industry to protect perhaps accounts for placing wool on the free list of the first

national tariff bill enacted, which was in 1789. Indeed, importations of wool were encouraged in order to give the few woolen or carding mills of the country raw material with which to work. There was a tariff of 5 per cent on woolen goods in 1789, 10 per cent in 1792, 15 per cent in 1794, and 17½ per cent in 1804; but the tariff was of but little benefit to the manufacturing industry until it was raised to 35 per cent in 1812.

The high tariff rates imposed during the War of 1812 and the previous prohibition of importations brought about by the embargo and the nonintercourse act shut off the supply of wool and woolen goods from abroad and placed the country on its own resources, and from 1808 until the end of the War of 1812 the growers of wool and the manufacturers of woolen goods had the benefit of almost absolute protection by the practical prohibition of imports of both the raw material and the manufactured article.

The effect on both wool producing and manufacturing was immediate. Factories increased rapidly in number, the price of wool advanced, and for the first time in our history wool-growing became an industry worthy of note. It was during this period that the merino was introduced into this country in any considerable number, and it has been estimated that between April 1, 1810, and August 31, 1811, some 20,000 high-grade merinos were brought into the United States from Spain and Portugal. The War of 1812 not only cut off the supply of wools from abroad but created an increased home demand in order to supply our troops with clothing, and prices of wool went soaring, pure merino wool selling in 1814 for from \$2 to \$3 a pound and common wool bringing from 30 to 50 cents a pound. In that year the country contained 10,000,000 sheep, and the wool clip was from twenty-two to twenty-four million pounds.

Following the close of the War of 1812, a determined struggle was made by England to capture American trade, and as soon as the inhibitions of the war were removed our markets were flooded with English woolen goods; and this led to the enactment of the tariff of 1816, which placed a 15 per cent ad valorem rate on wool and 25 per cent on woolen goods. Preceding the imposition of those rates the importations of British wool and woolen manufactures into the United States were phenomenal. In 1815 the importations of wool and woolsens amounted in value to \$50,000,000, and in 1816 to \$21,000,000. The flood was checked somewhat by the 1816 tariff, but the industry was crippled, and petitions poured in on Congress for higher tariff rates. In the face of the determination of England to absorb our markets and an inadequate duty to insure its protection, the woolen industry during this period gained strength. In 1824 a slight increase in tariff was secured; the wool tariff increased so that after 1826 it was 30 per cent, except that costing 10 cents or less, which remained at the old rate of 15 per cent; and the tariff on woolen goods raised to 30 per cent until 1825 and 33½ per cent thereafter.

The increased duties, however, did not prevent England from making a most desperate effort to destroy the wool growing and manufacturing industries of this country. The woolen trade of England was depressed, and many English firms sold their products in America for less than cost, large quantities of goods being sent over and sold at auction for what they would bring.

Niles's History of the Wool Industry thus describes the situation:

It is notorious that great sums of money were expended by the British to destroy our flocks of sheep, that they might thereby ruin our manufactories. They bought up and immediately slaughtered great numbers of our sheep. They bought our best machinery and sent it off to England, and hired our best mechanics and most skillful workmen to go to England simply to get them out of the country, and so hinder and destroy our existing and prospective manufactures.

In a memorial to Congress of the growers and manufacturers of wool, adopted at Woodstock, Vt., in December, 1826, it was stated:

Partly from England having glutted the South American market, partly from the repeal of the English duty on foreign wool, partly from the commercial and manufacturing distress which for 18 months past has pervaded that Kingdom, reducing the price of manufacturing labor to less than one-half the former rate, and partly from frauds committed on our revenue by English agents in this country involving their goods far below their cost and rendering the protection given by the tariff of 1824 a perfect nullity, our country has again been deluged with British goods.

An increase in the wool tariff was granted in the act of 1828, and for the first time a specific duty was placed on wool importations. This, despite the continued fierce competition of England, kept the woolgrowing and wool manufactures of the country on an up-grade, until in 1830 a period of prosperity dawned, the price of wool went up, and the business became one of the firmly established industries of the country, accumulating

sufficient strength to withstand the inroads upon it made by subsequent "compromise" and revenue tariffs and even free trade in the raw material.

Not content to "let well enough alone," the tariff act of 1832-33 and the "compromise" act of 1833-34 placed wool valued at not over 8 cents a pound on the free list and lowered the rates on the higher grades. These reductions were followed in each instance by heavy importations of wool and woolsens—as usual, the woolgrower getting the worst of it—the increase in manufactured goods being but 75 per cent, while imports of raw wool increased 250 per cent.

WOOL INDUSTRY HARD HIT BY TARIFF REDUCTIONS.

The wool industry was hard hit by the panic of 1837, which brought a sharp drop in the price of wool, and wool manufacturers were demoralized. The decline in wool prices continued until 1843, when, under the stimulus of a specific duty on raw wool imposed by the protective act of August 30, 1842, prices began to go upward, culminating in 1853, when prices were double what they were in 1843.

Ohio fine-washed wool in 1843 was 33 cents per pound; in 1853, 66 cents.

The ideal tariff bill, from the viewpoint of free-trade and tariff-without-protection advocates, has always been, since its enactment and until recently, the Walker Act of 1846, which reduced the duties on manufactured goods and placed ad valorem rates on raw material. This policy was designed to have the consumer buy in the cheapest markets of the world and the producer of raw material sell in foreign markets, the theory being the pleasing one that we would sell our products in high markets and buy our supplies in low markets.

But, while the theory was alluring, the practical result was different. Representative Covode, of Pennsylvania, in a speech in the House in 1857, thus explained the workings of the Walker Act:

The tariff of 1846 imposes a duty of 30 per cent on wool, while the duty on blankets is only 20 per cent, thus making a discrimination in favor of the foreign manufacturer and against our own of 10 per cent. Under this tariff the importation of blankets ran up last year to over \$6,000,000. Now, who is benefited by this condition of things but the foreign manufacturer and foreign woolgrower? Probably not one pound of American wool entered into the composition of this enormous amount of imported goods. Had the duty been so arranged as to enable our own manufacturers to make this article, it would have afforded a market at home for about 8,000,000 pounds of wool. Thus it will be seen that the interest of the woolgrower is to have a sufficient protection for the manufacturers to enable them to make all such goods, thereby securing a market for his wool at home, as it is not to be supposed that the American woolgrower will be able to go into the markets of the world in competition with the Russian and Australian producers.

The Walker tariff law was changed by the act of 1857, which placed nearly all raw materials on the free list. All wool costing less than 20 cents a pound was made free and the duty reduced from 30 per cent to 24 per cent ad valorem on wool costing more than that amount. The duty on woolen goods was reduced from 30 per cent to 24 per cent ad valorem.

The crisis and panic of 1857, which followed closely the enactment of the tariff law of that year, was particularly severe upon the wool manufacturing industry. Wool prices were nominal, and some grades were not salable at any price.

The free-trade tariffs of 1846 and 1857 not only failed to benefit the wool growing and manufacturing industries, but gave both a decided setback from the prosperous condition in which they were placed by the protective tariff of 1842. Under that act and prior to the passage of the Walker Act the country was on the verge of becoming an exporter of wool. The New York Evening Post is quoted in Niles's Register of the Wool Industry as saying, in 1844:

We have already referred to the fact, that is becoming every year more certain, viz, that this country is adapted by means of its extensive prairies to become in a few years a larger producer and exporter of wool than any other nation.

In fact, American wools—one lot from Oregon—began to appear in the London markets. But conditions soon changed and the Walker Act put a quietus on hopes that we might become exporters of wool.

FAVORABLE EFFECT OF PROTECTIVE TARIFF.

The Morrill tariff act of March 2, 1861, was a return to the protective system of tariff legislation. It increased duties generally about 10 per cent and changed many rates from ad valorem to specific. Wool duties were made specific, and the protective rates of this act, combined with the effects of the order issued by Secretary Stanton in 1862, which prohibited purchases of all articles of clothing for the Army from being made abroad if they could be purchased in the United States, brought about a great expansion in the wool growing and manufacturing industries. In the woolen industry the consumption of wool increased from 98,379,785 pounds in 1860 to 219,970,174 pounds in

1870, or 123.59 per cent. The domestic wool clip increased during the decade from 60,000,000 to 180,000,000 pounds. The number of operatives employed increased from 59,322 in 1890 to 110,859 in 1870, and the wages paid increased from \$13,361,602 to \$40,357,238.

Joint conventions held by wool manufacturers and woolgrowers in 1865 led to a readjustment of the tariff through the act of March 2, 1867, by which the relative duties on raw wool and manufactures of wool were arranged on what was deemed a scientific and equitable basis and ratio.

That act has been called the most important in the history of wool and woollens, in that it established a ratio for the duties on wool and woollen goods which, except for the reduction in duties in 1883 and the brief period of free wool of the Wilson-Gorman Act, has remained substantially the same to the present day.

Under the 1867 rates of about 10 cents a pound the wool-growing industry flourished and the production of wool increased from 160,000,000 pounds in 1867 to 300,000,000 in 1884. Sheep numbered 39,385,386 in 1867 and 50,626,626 in 1884.

Tariff agitation in 1882 resulted in the creation of the tariff commission of that year, which prepared a bill that, with many changes and amendments, became a law July 1, 1883. The law proved unsatisfactory to both political parties. The changes made in the rates on woollen goods affected the wool growing and manufacturing industries disastrously.

The Mills bill of 1888, which provoked a most extended tariff discussion in the campaign of 1888, formed the issue in that campaign which resulted in the election of President Harrison and a Republican Congress.

It is worthy of note that the wool schedule of the Mills bill was almost identical with Schedule K of the Underwood bill. It proposed placing wool on the free list and imposing a duty of about 40 per cent on woollen goods. The minority report of the Ways and Means Committee of the House, signed by William D. Kelley, Thomas M. Browne, Thomas B. Reed, William McKinley, jr., and Julius C. Burrows, in dealing with the wool schedule might well apply to the pending Underwood-Simmons bill. The report in part recites:

Nowhere in the bill is the ultimate purpose of its authors more manifest than in its treatment of wool. It places the product on the free list and exposes our flocks and fleeces to merciless competition from abroad. In this respect the bill is but the echo of the President's message, and gives emphasis to the settled purpose of the majority to break down one of the most valuable industries of the country. It is public proclamation that the American policy of protection, so long adhered to and under which has been secured unprecedented prosperity in every department of human effort, is to be abandoned.

Why have the majority put wool on the free list? First, the purpose is to bring down the price of wool. If this should be the result, we inquire at whose expense and loss? It must be at the expense of the American woolgrower, and to his loss. * * * The injury, by the confession of the majority, will fall upon the American woolgrower. He is to be the first victim. He can find no profitable foreign market, if he is unable to hold his own, and it is absurd to talk about enlarging the market for his product at home with the wool of the world crowding our shores unchecked by customhouse duties. * * *

The bill will greatly increase importations of the foreign product and diminish, if not wholly destroy, our own production. Every nation ought, if possible, to produce its clothing as well as its food. This nation can do both, if the majority will let it alone.

The majority asserts that we must produce our woollen goods at lower cost and be able to undersell the foreign product. And after this how is the lower cost to be secured? First, by fleecing the woolgrower, and next by reducing the labor cost in the manufacture. How are we to undersell the foreign product? By making the cost of manufacturing less than theirs. In other words, by cutting down the wages of our skilled and unskilled labor, not to the foreign standard simply, but below it, for the product must cost us less if we undersell our competitors. The American farmer will not quietly submit to this injustice. The American workman will indignantly repel this effort to degrade his labor.

How apropos this report to the present situation! We have a Democratic majority forced by a minority-elected President, who received 150,000 fewer votes in 1912 than Mr. Bryan received in 1908 and more than 1,300,000 less than a majority in 1912, to put wool on the free list against its, the Congress's, intention, which was to levy a duty of 15 per cent upon wool importations.

The McKinley Act of 1890, the Dingley Act of 1897, and the Payne Act of 1909 maintained protective duties on wool and manufactures of wool practically unchanged for the period from 1890 to 1913, with the exception of the three years of free wool, 1894 to 1897, covered by the Wilson-Gorman Act.

THE 1894 FREE-TRADE FIASCO.

I am not going to enlarge upon the effect of the Cleveland Administration and the free-wool provision of the Wilson-Gorman Act on the wool industry. Suffice it to say that previous to 1894 we were importing annually about 140,000,000 pounds of wool. During the fiscal year 1894, just previous to the enactment of the Wilson-Gorman law, the imports fell off to 55,000,000 pounds in anticipation of the repeal of the duty. During the three years 1895, 1896, and 1897, identical with the operation of the Wilson-Gorman law, the imports amounted to nearly

800,000,000 pounds, or an average of over 260,000,000 pounds a year, not only displacing what should have been the American production, but reducing the price received by the American woolgrower from 40 to 50 per cent. Under the blight of free wool the number of sheep in this country decreased in three years from 47,000,000 to less than 37,000,000, and the value of our flocks decreased from \$127,000,000 to \$67,000,000, a loss in value of nearly 50 per cent.

Not only was our market flooded with woollen goods, but under the reduced duties on shoddy and rags imposed by the Wilson-Gorman Act the imports of shoddy and rags increased from 48,606 pounds during the last year of the McKinley Act term to 6,556,199 pounds under the first year of the Wilson-Gorman tariff.

In 1890, under a duty of 10 cents a pound, the imports of rags and shoddy amounted to 584,172 pounds.

During the four years of the operation of the McKinley bill, with a duty of 30 cents a pound on shoddy, the imports were 1,554,993 pounds.

During the three years of the operation of the Wilson-Gorman Act, with a duty of 15 per cent ad valorem, the importations were 46,016,762 pounds—the importations in 1897 alone, while the importers were trying to rush all they could into the country before the rates were raised, being 28,192,399 pounds.

Under the 12 years' operation of the Dingley Act, with a rate of 25 cents a pound, the total importation of shoddy was only 2,087,054 pounds.

Thus the average annual importation under a duty of 30 cents a pound and with dutiable wool, was only 388,748 pounds. Under 15 per cent ad valorem and free wool as high as 15,338,920 pounds. Under 25 cents a pound and dutiable wool, only 178,754 pounds.

In view of these figures what may we expect when the bars are all down and shoddy comes in absolutely free for the first time in our history?

In reference to the domestic production of shoddy, the Tariff Board reported that the industry in the United States has made no decided growth during the last decade. The number of establishments has declined and the value of products has increased only slightly.

The rate of duty of 25 cents a pound has almost completely kept out importations, and this, with the declining production at home, has tended during the past 10 to 15 years to give us better grades of home manufactured clothing than during any previous period.

Concerning the production of shoddy in England, the Tariff Board reported:

The greatest shoddy-producing center in the world is in and near Batley and Dewsbury, England. Of the 900 rag-grinding machines in the United Kingdom, Yorkshire, in which Batley and Dewsbury are located, has 881 machines. * * * In 1907 the United Kingdom is reported to have produced 137,056,000 pounds of shoddy valued at \$8,749,967.

The Underwood-Simmons bill places shoddy on the free list, which is a plain invitation to cheapen our clothing with adulterants made from the rags and refuse of England and other foreign countries. No one will gain by this operation but the rag merchant, the rag grinder, and shoddy manufacturer of England and France. The one who will lose correspondingly will be the wearer of cheap and moderate-priced clothing—the consumer. He may think he is buying serviceable articles, only to find that they will go to pieces in the first rainstorm or during the first damp day which overtakes him.

Placing shoddy on the free list is placing a premium on deception and fraud, with the innocent wearer of clothing as the victim.

Shall we thus advertise ourselves as a shoddy Nation?

UNITED STATES NOT A SHODDY NATION.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. WARREN. Certainly.

Mr. WALSH. I should like to understand very much more clearly than I do now the position of the Senator with respect to that matter. My understanding is that a protective tariff is imposed for the purpose of stimulating home production. I gather that the Senator wants a duty on shoddy and on rags for some other reason than to stimulate the home production of shoddy and rags.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator has guessed just right.

Mr. WALSH. But why will not a protective tariff on shoddy and rags stimulate the production of shoddy and rags in this country, if it will stimulate the production of any other product—wool, for instance?

Mr. WARREN. We certainly keep out the foreigners, the greatest shoddy manufacturers of the world, in that way.

Mr. WALSH. Exactly. Then how do you protect the domestic consumer from the use of such goods as you describe, when you promote the production of shoddy and rags in this country?

Mr. WARREN. In the first place, the production in this country is very slight, because of the lack of the material.

Mr. WALSH. But you do not prevent the use of it.

Mr. WARREN. In the next place, we are not a shoddy-wearing nation, if honesty is practiced in the making of clothes.

Mr. WALSH. Then, as I understand the Senator, while we will not wear shoddy goods made from domestic shoddy, we will consume enormous quantities made from imported shoddy?

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, the Senator is very ingenious; I will not say ingenuous. A certain amount of shoddy pressed into felts and coarse material can be absorbed without imposing upon the wearer of clothes. But to undertake to let into this country the product of all these other countries, to make this the dumping place, and to use it in clothing, is to wrong the wearers of clothing.

Mr. WALSH. One more question: Will not the Senator agree with me fully that the only legitimate way to meet that condition is to pass an appropriate act branding these goods so that the public may be informed as to the character of the goods they buy?

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I do not know what the record of the Senator has been heretofore regarding that particular matter, but I have had it under consideration. I have here on my desk a report of a hearing where I appeared before a committee of the House to advocate a thorough investigation with that end in view. I was one to respond favorably to a resolution, introduced, I think, by a Senator from Montana, Mr. Clark, or possibly by the Senator from New York, Mr. Platt. I am not entirely certain that I did not introduce one myself. Difficulties were met at that time. It was clearly a matter that would have to come up from the House, under the guise of being a revenue measure. If the Senator from Montana wishes to introduce that matter and follow it up, I shall be very glad to be of any assistance I can, as I have been before.

Mr. WALSH. A bill of that character is now before the Senate, introduced by my colleague; and as a matter of course I shall be very glad to have the earnest and valuable assistance of the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. WARREN. As the Senator knows, and as I think the Senator's colleague must admit, it is a matter that must come up from the House.

Mr. WALSH. I do not see why. I can not understand at all why it should.

Mr. WARREN. I will simply say to the Senator that if he will look at the oleomargarine legislation, and what has been effected under it, he will see why. But why do not the Senator and his party include that regulation in with all the other various and sundry ministerial regulations now in the pending tariff measure?

Mr. WALSH. Before this colloquy is ended, I desire to say that it is perfectly obvious now, from the remarks of the Senator, that the protective tariff which has been imposed upon shoddy and rags has not met the condition, as he himself recognizes by his activity in behalf of such legislation as I suggest.

Mr. WARREN. I do not understand what the Senator means by that. What does he mean?

Mr. WALSH. I understand that the Senator from Wyoming himself has been active in promoting such legislation as I suggest, recognizing that the duties already imposed upon rags and shoddy do not meet the evil, and that it has not been eradicated in consequence of them.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, on the contrary I have been showing here with figures, not with words, that the use of it here, as a result of the high rate, has receded, and receded greatly.

Mr. WALSH. That is not the point I am referring to. The Senator has now told us about how heretofore he has been active—

Mr. WARREN. In what?

Mr. WALSH. In endeavoring to get such legislation as I suggested was the appropriate remedy for the evil of imposing shoddy goods upon the public.

Mr. WARREN. The legislation about which the Senator is speaking did not come up in the manner he presents it, as a shoddy measure. It came up as to all adulterants, without regard to whether they were cotton or wool, and proposed simply that they should be labeled with a description. Then, there came up the features of administration, and what might be the punishment for violation of the law, the penalty, and so forth. The Senator is a great lawyer, and I am not, and he perhaps may be able to set me right in this; but the great lawyers at that

time were not able to say that the matter could be digested and brought in in a revenue measure without some danger of its being declared unconstitutional, just as in the case of the oleomargarine bill. Many lawyers still think that is unconstitutional and ought to be tried out.

Mr. WALSH. As to that, I do not conceive that any lawyers can differ in respect to the power to initiate in this body an act requiring the branding of all goods in order that their character may be known to the purchasers. But that is altogether aside from the question. Whether the bill should originate in the other House or in this, I understand the Senator to say that the legislation has had his active support.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, the Senator must not misquote me. There has been no such legislation. What I said about it was that I had supported the resolution that called for an inquiry to see what might be done to effect such an end.

Mr. WALSH. Whatever was done had the concurrence and the approval of the Senator, because he recognized that the evil had not been met by the levy of a duty upon rags and shoddy.

Mr. WARREN. Very well, Mr. President; but that only incidentally touches shoddy. I wish to say now, with all respect to the Senator from Montana and to others, that I have never yet discussed the question of shoddy upon facts and history, with free-wool advocates, but that there was a shrinking and an attempt to divert me from shoddy itself into some side issue. I do not blame those who wish to divert attention from the shoddy question, and the legislation that has heretofore been mentioned.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. WARREN. Certainly.

Mr. WEEKS. I suppose everyone will agree that the larger percentage of wool and the smaller percentage of shoddy which appears in clothing, the better off the average citizen is. I wish to ask the Senator from Wyoming if it is not a fact that under the present law the proportion of shoddy used in goods in England has increased, while the proportion used in goods in the United States has decreased?

Mr. WARREN. That is true; and it is measurably true as to all free-trade countries, but more especially in England.

Mr. WEEKS. Does it not follow from that that if we put shoddy on the free list we are likely to be in exactly the same position that Great Britain is, and that the proportion of shoddy that will appear in our woolen clothes will increase as a result?

Mr. WARREN. Undoubtedly.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, in proof of that I wish to call the attention of the Senator from Montana to a few figures.

During the time the McKinley law was in force, three years and eight months, there were imported into this country 908,923 pounds of shoddy. During the time the Wilson bill was in force, three years and four months, there were imported into this country 86,263,630 pounds of shoddy. During the 13 years from 1898, since the Dingley law was passed, there have been imported into this country only 6,751,577 pounds.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. WARREN. I do, with pleasure.

Mr. WILLIAMS. How much shoddy was made in this country during those respective periods? I understand the Republican theory is that you put on a duty in order to protect the home production of a product. To what extent did it protect the home production of shoddy?

Mr. WARREN. The Senator speaks of the general policy of protection.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. WARREN. But I will say to the Senator that there are substances that we might protect the other way, by keeping them out as far as we can.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Very well; but I wish to know what was the effect upon the domestic production of shoddy. If the Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot] has those figures, they will be interesting.

Mr. SMOOT. One effect it has had, certainly, was that it kept the disease-bearing rags and shoddy of European countries out of the United States. Another effect was that the clothes made in the United States do not carry anywhere near the percentage of shoddy carried by clothes made in England and Germany.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Can the Senator give me the domestic production and consumption of shoddy during the periods he has referred to?

Mr. WARREN. I have already gone over that ground, and I have stated that there was no appreciable increase in the manufacture of shoddy in this country.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Where does the Senator get that information?

Mr. WARREN. I get it in the Tariff Board report, I get it in the Statistical Abstract, I get it in any of the official figures. I supposed that was too well known to make it necessary to put the exact figures in here. I shall be very glad to furnish them, however.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, I can give the Senator some figures on this point.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the importation of a thing is prevented, and the demand for it continues, it necessarily follows that the domestic production of it will increase.

Mr. WARREN. It has not so operated with us.

Mr. PENROSE. For the information of the Senator, if the Senator from Wyoming will permit me—

Mr. WARREN. Certainly.

Mr. PENROSE. British woolen mills, according to an official estimate, use 200,000,000 pounds of shoddy every year. The consumption of shoddy in the woolen mills of the United States in the year 1909, a year of active manufacturing, was less than 80,000,000 pounds. The use of shoddy is decreasing under the protective system of the United States. It is increasing under the tariff-for-revenue system of Great Britain.

I have here a memorandum which states that British manufacturers import rags for shoddy from all the world. The United States imports almost no rags and shoddy, but exports to British manufacturers every year thousands of bales of rags for which there is no adequate market and no active use in this country.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Whence does the Senator get his figures about the production of shoddy in America and the consumption of it by our mills?

Mr. PENROSE. From an official estimate. I can get the Senator the reference. I have not it here. I have here a good many figures where I have not a memorandum of the source of my information, but it is official.

Mr. WARREN. It is undisputed. The Senator can take that to be comparably true, because the fact is we are not naturally a shoddy country. We are not using shoddy, and we are not manufacturing shoddy at any increasing rate. The only way to increase its use is to let it come in free, and then if our workmen are out of work and too poor to buy good clothes, they are imposed upon by dealers selling them shoddy clothes.

Mr. PENROSE. I can give the Senator from Mississippi a statement from the Tariff Board report, page 72, as follows:

The greatest shoddy-producing center in the world is in and near Batley and Dewsbury, England. Of the 900 rag-grinding machines in the United Kingdom, Yorkshire, in which Batley and Dewsbury are located, has 881 machines. In the whole of the United States there are only 346 rag-grinding machines.

Less than half the number in one district in England.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Of course it goes without saying that there are more poor people in England, comparatively, than in the United States, and therefore more people who would wear shoddy.

Mr. WARREN. Why? Why are they poorer?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Because every old country that has exploited its resources to the full has a larger number of people who must buy cheap goods of every description, if they buy any at all.

Mr. WARREN. Has the eastern or older part of this country become poorer and less able to buy than the western part?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Oh, no; but the East has the market of the 90,000,000 people all over this entire country, who have not exhausted their resources nor fully developed them.

Mr. WARREN. And England has the whole world, and opens up her ports to everybody.

Mr. WILLIAMS. There is a magnificent free trade in this country from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

Mr. WARREN. England ought to have less poor people and more prosperity, if the theory of the Senators on the other side is correct.

Mr. WALSH. I desire to say, because reference was made to myself in this matter, that if the fact is as suggested by the Senator from Wyoming—and of course we all recognize that it is the fact—that there are in this country people too poor to buy woolen clothing made of the original long fiber, but able to buy clothing made of shoddy, which is nothing more than the short fiber. I should like to have some one tell me why we should legislate to deny to them the opportunity so to do. The only proper way to proceed in that matter is to have some act passed so that a man may know whether he is buying

clothing made of the long fiber, the original wool, or whether he is buying clothing made of shoddy, or renovated rags, or any other waste. So is not this discussion of shoddy and rags utterly irrelevant to any consideration of the question of the duty on wool?

Mr. WARREN. As to the relevancy, I assume the Senator will give me the same privilege that I will give him. Each one settles the relevancy for himself. As to what advice I would give the poor man, I would tell him to buy honest goods so that he would know he was getting his money's worth.

Let me ask the Senator a question. I have answered his. If he is in favor of having these manufactures of woollens labeled why not put it in the tariff bill? There is a great deal of legislative, executive, and administrative matter in the bill. Why does not the Senator put it in there? I will vote for it there, if he will put it in.

Mr. WALSH. I dare say the Senator will, but I do not see any reason why we should encumber this tariff bill with general legislation of that character.

Mr. WARREN. I simply ask the Senator why not put that in the bill. Why have you the present legislative matters in it?

Mr. WALSH. I do not see why we should put it in. Why should we not pass it immediately after this bill is disposed of?

Mr. WARREN. Why should we legislate on cotton futures in the pending bill?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, that is a revenue matter.

Mr. WARREN. This other will have to be a revenue matter, the Senator will find before he gets through with it.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. WARREN. I do.

Mr. WEEKS. The statement just made by the Senator from Pennsylvania to the effect that Great Britain imports rags not only from all parts of Europe but from the United States compels one to the observation that in that free-trade country they are clothing their people in rags and the result is that they are paying old-age pensions. And the purpose of this bill will be to put us exactly in the same position to wear shoddy and rags and to give old-age pensions to people who are not able to accumulate and take care of themselves.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to his colleague?

Mr. WARREN. With pleasure.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. It occurs to me we are all agreed that we ought not to clothe the American people with shoddy. The purpose of a tariff on shoddy is not, as the Senator from Mississippi well knows, to protect shoddy manufacturers in this country. It is to that extent—

Mr. WILLIAMS. I did not say that it was its intent. I said it was its effect.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Well, whatever its effect, that is not the purpose of it. The purpose of it is to keep out as far as possible shoddy and rags gathered from the slums of the earth and put on the backs of our American people to wear. The purpose that is involved in the bill of the colleague of the Senator from Montana is that if a man does wear this stuff he shall purchase it with his eyes open, and as far as possible to keep it out of the American market.

It seems to me that the very history of the shoddy legislation shows that we have kept out by a tariff on shoddy a tremendous amount of this unwholesome material. By putting the shoddy on the free list the country invites an increased importation of it. The only question is whether it is advisable to import it or keep it out. If it is advisable to import increased quantities of it, then throw the ports open to it. If it is advisable to keep it out then let us close our ports so far as we can to it.

I do not think it is a question of revenue. I do not think it is a question of protection. It is simply a question of keeping an unwholesome product out from our country and our manufactures. That is the way it occurs to me.

Mr. PENROSE. Will the Senator from Wyoming permit an interruption?

Mr. WARREN. Certainly.

Mr. PENROSE. While the Senator is giving these interesting figures on the extent of the woolgrowing and wool-manufacturing industry, I should like to ask him how many men, in his opinion, are employed or directly or indirectly interested in woolgrowing. The impression has been put forth in this discussion by those advocating free wool that only a scanty number of shepherds here and there, at very low wages and not of very high character, are much concerned about the industry. If the Senator has the figures—

Mr. WARREN. Does the Senator refer to those who are interested in sheep and woolgrowing and wool manufacture—

Mr. PENROSE. I do not refer to the manufacture of wool, but to woolgrowing.

Mr. WARREN. Those who have given it a life study maintain that at least a million people are interested in woolgrowing. Of course, there are not a million shepherds or a million herds of sheep, but that is estimated to be the number of those who are interested in the industry.

Mr. JAMES. I should like to ask the Senator a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. WARREN. I shall after a moment. Now, as to the character of the sheep industry, it may serve the purpose of advancing the interest of this tariff bill to review the character of a certain class of workmen. I know of no industry except of a very highly skilled or scientific nature but that has in its employment some low-priced and ignorant men. But, as I said yesterday, so far as the sheep herders are concerned in Wyoming, they are equally as intelligent as any other class of people. I said truthfully that many college graduates took up that avocation, some to learn it because they wished to interest themselves in it, others because it was a healthful avocation. I have here, which if it was not too long I would ask to put in the Record, a story in the Living Age copied from Blackwood's Magazine, written by a sheep herder doing the ordinary sheep herder's work. The reading of it will show a very highly educated man and a very fluent writer. I should be glad to loan it to the Senator from Pennsylvania or any Senator who believes that that industry may not have intelligence in its employees.

Mr. PENROSE. I do not believe that. I do not want to have that impression conveyed.

Mr. WARREN. I know very well you do not. I now yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. JAMES. The Senator has been telling us about the development of the sheep industry. Could the Senator tell us how many States of the Union produce more wool than the people in those States consume?

Mr. WARREN. I do not know that I have the statistics here at hand at this moment for that kind of a comparison. It would be very easy to figure it out. But perhaps the Senator will tell me what he wishes to follow that with?

Mr. JAMES. I want to ask the Senator if it is not true that only 10 States in the Union produce more wool than the people in those States consume?

Mr. WARREN. What would be the inference?

Mr. JAMES. The inference is that the people of various States—for instance, of Kentucky, where they produce about 3,000,000 pounds of wool—are being taxed to buy 14,000,000 pounds of wool; and the industry, however much it has developed, the Senator, of course, can not deny that in the last 10 years the sheep production has fallen off about \$12,000,000.

Mr. PENROSE. Will the Senator from Wyoming permit me?

Mr. WARREN. Will the Senator allow me a moment in answer to the Senator from Kentucky?

I wish first to say that I have already proven that such figures of decrease are not correct. And, Mr. President, we have to support this Government. It is going to be done partially by taxation. I am one of those who believe that we can tax the foreigner when he comes in here for his license to trade and do business in our market; and if a man is not engaged in woolgrowing and he pays 15 or 20 cents, or a dollar even, more for a suit of wool clothing, he has contributed that much to help support the Government.

But now turn it another way. If there are so many States that do not raise wool, compare that with the manufacturing of wools. There are surely fewer woolen manufacturers than there are sheepmen, and yet the sheep grower and everybody else is assessed on the Senator's theory to pay the tariff on woolen goods.

Now, I will put a question to the Senator. How many States are there in the Union that grow more rice than they consume?

Mr. JAMES. There are very few States that grow more rice than they consume.

Mr. WARREN. Yet you tax them all.

Mr. JAMES. So far as I am individually concerned, I am no advocate of a tariff upon rice. It is only for the purpose of obtaining revenue. If rice were as universally used as clothing and as essential, then there might be something in the Senator asking me the question as to how many States produce more rice than they consume.

Mr. WARREN. Of course the Senator understands the situation. I have been in the game. I have heard it stated on this floor, on both sides by eminent men, that no man ever in the

Senate or House voted for a tariff bill that suited him in all its particulars. Of course we may all have things in any bill to which we may object. But the Senator's explanation of rice does not explain, because I do not know of a table in the country where rice does not appear as a matter of food.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. President—

Mr. WARREN. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. JAMES. I think the Senator is entirely mistaken about rice being of as universal consumption as he states. I am not familiar with the West, but I would say that in Kentucky there are not 2 families out of 10 that use rice.

Mr. WARREN. There are a great many families that use little or no wool, especially in a warm climate.

Mr. JAMES. The point I am trying to call to the attention of the Senator is that 38 States in the Union produce less wool than they consume, and I am going to put into the Record before this argument is through a statement of the inhabitants in each State and the number of pounds produced in each State and the amount of wool consumed by the people of each State, so that the public may know how much each State is being taxed for the purpose of growing the number of sheep that are produced there.

Mr. WARREN. I should like, if the Senator will give me notice then, to file as accurately as I can the number of States which have woolen and cotton factories, and the States which do not have such factories. The inhabitants of all the States must pay the tariff attached to the duty on cotton and woolen goods. If the Senator is logical he must of course take the tariff off of everything that is consumed or worn provided there are more people in every State engaged in other businesses, and so forth.

Now, suppose it is true, as the Senator states, that we have fewer sheep than produce the amount of wool used in each State, that is all the more reason why, if it is an industry which ought to be protected, we should protect it. It is not a matter of wool alone. The Senator did not do me the honor to remain while I was discussing the mutton end of the proposition. Where will we be in the matter of meat if we do not raise mutton in this country? The sheep industry in this country so far has never reached the stage, admittedly on all hands, where it will pay on the wool alone or on the mutton alone, but in raising wool and mutton together we greatly increase the mutton crop, we keep the price down, and that contributes to keeping the price of hog and cattle products down.

Mr. JAMES. If the Senator will permit me, I do not think he can liken an argument which he has just made that this tariff upon wool was solely for the benefit of the farmer to the proposition as to how many manufactories of woolen goods there are in the country. The point of the question I asked the Senator was to try to develop what he has to say, as he has argued that this tariff was for the benefit of the farmer, on the proposition as to the number of sheep upon the farms, as to the amount of wool produced in each State, as compared with the amount that the people in that State consume.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I hardly think that the suggestion of the Senator from Kentucky is entirely responsive to the situation. I hardly think that he should consider the amount of a particular article in a single State and compare it with the amount of that article consumed elsewhere. My own notion is that we should consider the amount of that article produced in the United States, and then the amount of that article consumed in the United States. My own belief is that we ought to raise everything so far as we can that is consumed here; in other words, that we ought to direct our money into such channels in our purchases that it would go to the benefit of the people of the whole United States rather than flow out of the United States in channels to other countries.

Now, if we can produce all the wool that we use here so much the better for this country. If we produce only one-half of the wool that is used here, even though that were all produced in one State, we must send out of the country the money for the other half that otherwise would be retained here. That is the way it occurs to me.

Mr. JAMES. But I will state to the Senator—

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. And if you come down to levying a tax with reference to a single State of the Union or upon products which may be produced in only one State of the Union, it seems to me it is begging the question.

Mr. JAMES. That may be the Senator's opinion, and of course it is, but I made the inquiry for the purpose of demonstrating that this argument which he has made that the tariff upon wool is all for the benefit of the farmer can not be sustained, because the great majority of the farmers, nine-tenths of the farmers of this country I may say, are burdened with this tariff upon wool instead of benefited, and it is only

the great sheep owners of certain regions of the United States that are favored by this tariff. The argument that it is for the farmers as a whole can not be sustained.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I was making no argument for anybody. Of course, I recognize that the Senator from Kentucky and myself can not meet on any common ground in regard to the farmer because the Senator from Kentucky has the view that it is the best thing for the people of this country to buy where they can buy the cheapest, no matter where they go for it. I take the opposite view, that a protective tariff even if it does raise the price to the consumer, and that is denied by some, is on the whole a benefit to that consumer and the whole country. Consequently we have no common ground upon which we may start an argument.

But I think the Senator will agree with me that if we can raise all we need to use here it is so much the better for this country, because it gives employment here where otherwise the employment would be abroad, because it keeps men at work here where otherwise they would be idle here and be at work abroad. It seems to me to be a broader question than is covered by mere State lines or any individual locality where any particular product may be produced or manufactured.

Mr. JAMES. My position is simply this, that the taxing power of the Government can not be used except for the purpose of obtaining sufficient revenue to run the Government honestly and economically administered and that the power of taxation can not be legitimately or righteously used for the purpose of taking money out of the pockets of the masses of men in order to fill up the pockets of the few.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I understand the Senator's argument, but I will say that in this bill the Democratic Party are deliberately slaughtering their sources of greatest revenue. Here you are throwing into the waste heap \$15,000,000 revenue by this very wool item, and on sugar two or three times that amount. Your revenue-producing-theory you are carrying out.

Mr. JAMES. The Senator says we are throwing it into the waste heap. It may be that to leave in the pockets of the people—

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I withdraw that phrase.

Mr. JAMES. It may be that when you fail to tax the people you are throwing it into the waste heap, but the more we throw into that sort of waste heap the happier the people will be.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I will withdraw the phrase. I mean that you are sacrificing the revenue. This is supposed to be, as I understand it, a bill for the purpose of raising revenue for the Government, and you are throwing away a vast quantity of revenue on the various items. You are supplying that revenue, or attempting to supply it, by a direct tax. Under the estimates on the bill, if carried out to the fullest extent, you have a bare \$3,000,000 over and above what you estimate the expenses of the Government will be for the succeeding year.

Mr. JAMES. I can not agree with the argument made by the Senator that any Government is throwing away money which it fails by taxation to take from the people.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Oh, Mr. President, I withdraw the word "waste."

Mr. JAMES. To leave it in the pockets of the people is not throwing it away.

Mr. GALLINGER. Will the Senator permit me?

Mr. WARREN. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. I have been quietly seeking light during this debate as to exactly what a tariff for revenue means. I think I understood the Senator from Kentucky to say that he was only exacting from the people taxes sufficient to maintain the Government and pay its running expenses. Now, does the Senator mean to say that he would not in a tariff law make any provision to equalize in any way the difference in cost between foreign countries and this country, but that he would put us in open unrestricted, unqualified competition with all other nations of the world?

Mr. JAMES. In making a tariff bill, I would not tax the whole country as the Senator would for the purpose of protection. I would have in view the purpose of obtaining revenue, and the purpose of obtaining revenue, of course, being the primary purpose for which the bill was framed, the question of protection would not and could not be considered. So it is in this bill.

Mr. WARREN. At the same time it would follow as an incident of protection.

Mr. JAMES. If it follows, it is not the purpose that it should follow in the making of the bill.

Mr. WARREN. But it does follow.

Mr. JAMES. It may be incidental.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator admits it does follow.

Mr. JAMES. Not always; it sometimes follows.

Mr. WARREN. But generally.

Mr. JAMES. The difference between our party and yours is that you legislate for the purpose of enriching a favored few in giving them protection, or the right to tax all the people and lose sight of the Treasury, when the constitutional right of taxation exists not for favored interests, but for the Treasury of all the people, and we legislate for the Treasury, and do not look out for the favored few.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, the Republican Party has been taking pretty good care of the Treasury all through its history. The only trouble we have had with the Treasury has been when the Democratic Party has been in power. But the Senator does not frankly answer my question. Did the Senator mean to say exactly what he did say, that he was in favor of a tariff for revenue only, without any reference to the difference between the cost of production in this country and European and Asiatic countries? Is that the attitude of the Senator?

Mr. JAMES. Just exactly as I said I was. My language I think is susceptible of fairly good understanding.

Mr. GALLINGER. I think I understood the Senator.

Mr. JAMES. I am in favor of a tariff for revenue only. The purpose of the Democratic Party and my purpose in supporting the bill is not to give protection to anybody but to secure sufficient revenue to run the Government and at the same time to keep the markets of this country unmonopolized, untrussed, and uncontrolled as they have been trussed and monopolized and controlled by legislation of the Republican Party.

Mr. GALLINGER. I do not know what "trussed" means, so I will not try to answer that.

Mr. JAMES. It is not very frequently that the Republicans do know what that means.

Mr. GALLINGER. Does the Senator mean to say that if he could construct a bill that by levying an income tax and an internal-revenue tax of that kind would meet the expenses of the Government he would be unwilling to place anything in that bill which would protect the laboring people of this country in getting twice the wages that are paid abroad, and that he would open all our markets to foreigners to take possession of them? Is that the Senator's position?

Mr. JAMES. I am not in favor of protection in any form or in any shape because there never was an argument in favor of a protective tariff which could be advocated upon any other theory except that it takes from the pockets of all the people the money that they themselves earn and gives it to somebody else who never earned it.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator is in open conflict with the views entertained by all the great Democrats of this country until a very recent period of its history.

Mr. JAMES. I am not in open conflict with the platform of the Democratic Party adopted over here at Baltimore. I am in absolute accord with that.

Mr. GALLINGER. I think not. When the Senator is advocating free wool I think he is in direct opposition to it.

Mr. JAMES. I think I demonstrated here at least to the satisfaction of a good many people, if not to the satisfaction of the Senator, that the Democratic Party had indorsed free sugar. At a future time I perhaps shall have something to say upon that point in the argument of the Senator.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, if I could reconcile the views of a free-trader Democrat with those of an old-line protectionist by permitting the debate to go on here all the afternoon, I should consider it the happiest and best afternoon of my life. But as we can not do that, and as the Senator has now propounded some interrogatories to me, I wish to make this observation. The Senator uses a phrase that has become now common and hackneyed. I say it with all respect, of course—"taxing the pockets of all the people to benefit a few." Every tax that you put on, whether you put it on for revenue or protection, brings the same result, if it enhances the cost of the thing you take it from, whether all are engaged in producing it or not. In the bill that is before us, in the items generally upon which you have preserved a tariff, you take it out of my pocket and yours and everyone else's to pay that tariff or tax, upon your theory. When you come to the tariff on wool I wish to remind you that it has reached nearly \$20,000,000 revenue to the Government in one year, and as my colleague has stated, \$14,000,000 or \$16,000,000 per annum generally. Now, how much revenue will rice produce on the tariff which you have assessed? We will now treat it as a matter of income from revenue.

I maintain, Mr. President, that, taking the matter of revenue alone, that collected on wool and woollens stands next to that on sugar, and sugar is at the head of the list of all revenue

producers. To strike off all the protection immediately from wool—one of those products that have been protected for nearly 100 years—to ruthlessly strike it off, and still retain it upon rice and a few matters like that to obtain that revenue, does not seem to be logical, but sectional, if not political.

I might allude to whisky produced in Kentucky. The answer probably would be that that pays an internal-revenue tax. Nevertheless there are only a few States in the Union where they make whisky, while there are a great many States where they drink it.

Mr. JAMES. But the difference between whisky and wool is—

Mr. WARREN. There is a lot of difference.

Mr. JAMES. The difference is that wool is a necessity and whisky is a luxury. There is no protective duty on whisky, but there is an internal-revenue tax, which is a burden to the production of whisky. If there were a consumption tax upon wool, there would not be any protection to the wool industry of the country.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I remember a time when there was no tax on whisky and when the price of wool in this country was very high owing to Democratic legislation, and the scarcity of sheep and wool that followed. I do not know that it became an article of common necessity then, any more than it is now.

I shall, however, return to my remarks.

INDUSTRY SAVED BY DINGLEY ACT.

The Dingley Act, of July 24, 1897, made a phenomenal change for the better from the distressing times of the Wilson-Gorman tariff period. Although our markets were overstocked with foreign goods, our home industries revived almost immediately. In 1896 the number of sheep was 36,818,643; the value, \$67,020,942. In 1898 the number was 39,114,453; the value, \$107,097,530. Thus in two years the number of sheep increased over 6 per cent, and the value 60 per cent.

Mr. President, it is constantly being thrown up to those who advocate adequate duties on wool and its manufactures that the wool industry has not prospered under the Republican tariff policy, and figures are quoted to show that we have fewer sheep in the country than we had four, five, or six years ago. In 1897, the last year of the Wilson-Gorman tariff, we had in this country 36,818,643 sheep, valued at \$67,020,942; in 1913 we have 51,482,000 sheep, valued at \$202,779,000. (See Statistical Abstract, 1912, p. 194.) Thus under the 16 years of the Republican tariff policy the number of sheep in the country has increased 14,663,357, or about an average of 900,000 a year. Their value has increased \$135,759,058, or about 100 per cent.

The amount and value of the wool production in the country in 1899 was:

Production	_____pounds	276,567,584
Value	_____	\$45,670,053

The amount and value of the production in 1912 was:

Production	_____pounds	304,043,400
Value	_____	\$75,819,251

Thus the increase in annual production in 14 tariff years was 27,475,816 pounds, or 10 per cent; and the increase in annual value was \$30,149,198, or 66½ per cent.

The census reports on wool manufactures show that in 1900 the wages paid in wool manufactures amounted to \$57,933,817; in 1910 the amount was \$87,962,669, an increase in 10 years under the Dingley tariff policy of \$30,028,852, or over 50 per cent.

The reports show that the value of wool manufactures in the United States in 1900 amounted to \$296,990,484; the value in 1910 was \$507,166,710, an increase of \$210,176,226, or 70 per cent. (See Statistical Abstract, 1912, p. 779.)

On the other hand, the importations of raw wool in 1897, the last year under the Wilson-Gorman tariff, amounted to 350,852,026 pounds. The importations for 1912 were but 191,680,843 pounds.

The importations of manufactures of wool in 1896, under the Wilson-Gorman Act, amounted to \$56,582,432, and in 1897 to \$49,162,992. The importations for 1912 under the Dingley Act policy amounted to but \$14,912,619.

The general trend of the period under the Dingley and Payne Acts has been in the direction of increased production over the period of the Wilson-Gorman Act in number and value of sheep and in quantity of wool.

The trend in the use of foreign wool and the use of foreign manufactures of wool under the Dingley and Payne Acts has been downward, while under the Wilson-Gorman Act it was phenomenally upward.

This brings to mind the reported saying of President Lincoln that, while he did not profess to understand the tariff question, yet it appeared to him that—

When an American paid \$20 for steel rails to an English manufacturer, America had the steel and England had the \$20. But when he paid \$20 for the steel to an American manufacturer, America had both the steel and the \$20.

UPS AND DOWNS OF WOOL INDUSTRY.

The woolgrowing industry has had many hard scares thrown into it during the period of protective duties, tending in great degree, at times, to "bear" wool prices and discourage those engaged in woolgrowing. Hanging over the industry for years was the reciprocity treaty with Argentina, proposing to let wool in from that country at reduced tariff rates. At all times has there been tariff agitation with wool as the storm center and point of attack—facts not overlooked each wool-selling season by some buyers in their efforts to beat down prices.

The woolgrowing industry also has had to contend during the past five years with the vicissitudes of droughts in summer followed by extremely severe winters, which in some parts of the western sheep-growing country decimated the flocks of the growers. Troubles of this kind, with consequent heavy losses, drive the woolgrower to send his remaining stock to the shambles, and the number of sheep in the country thus depreciates.

I note that the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] referred to President Taft's alleged remark that Schedule K of the Payne-Aldrich Act was indefensible; and few Democratic speeches are made that do not quote that remark. If President Taft ever made the statement in the form attributed to him, it was neither a careful nor correct designation of Schedule K. In passing, I would say that practical business men do not now, and did not during his term as President, regard Mr. Taft as an infallible authority on the tariff. His education on the subject was gained largely in the classroom and not in the plowed field or the mercantile establishment, where practical truths rather than alluring theories are obtained.

If the views of the present Chief Executive had not also been acquired almost wholly within college confines, many of our citizens would be less inclined than they now are to designate them as tinged with pedantry, and would have more confidence in seeing them put into effect in connection with the great business affairs of the present day.

President Taft may have thought and may have said that Schedule K was indefensible. If so, his view was that of one not familiar with the details of the woolgrowing and wool-manufacturing industries.

Later, when an exhaustive investigation was made by the Tariff Board of the woolgrowing and wool-manufacturing industries, facts were placed before the country showing conclusively that Schedule K is defensible and that the rates of duty on raw wool carried by the Dingley and Payne Acts are not unreasonably high and are not beyond what is required to equalize the competition between the higher cost of production in this country and the lower cost in Argentina, Australia, and other large-producing foreign countries.

TARIFF BOARD FINDINGS.

The findings of the Tariff Board were made from investigations of the woolgrowing business covering 173 counties in 19 States. Nearly 1,200 wool growers were visited and interviewed by expert agents of the board, and special agents gathered information from Australia, South America, England, and the Continent.

In regard to wool manufacturing, information was obtained from 174 mills situated in 20 different States, representing 46,000 looms, 1,900,000 producing spindles, and 109,000 employees.

Complete investigation was made in reference to wages and efficiency of labor and machinery.

In its findings the board reported that it costs more to grow wool in the United States than in any other country; that the merino wools required in such great volume by our mills are the most expensive of all wools produced; that the highest average cost of production of such wool in the world is in the State of Ohio and contiguous territory; and that the lowest average cost of producing similar wool is in Australia.

The board also found:

That after crediting the flock with receipts from all sources other than wool, the latter product, in the case of the fine merino wools of the United States, is going to market with an average charge against it of not less than 12 cents per pound, not including interest on the investment.

That the fine wools of the Ohio region are sold bearing an average charge of production of 19 cents per pound.

That in the States east of the Missouri River wool production is incidental to general farming. Here producers, with the exception of certain named districts, lay more stress upon the output of the mutton than of wool, and in such cases the receipts from the sale of sheep

and lambs ordinarily cover the flock expense, leaving the wool for profit. The position of the fine-wool producers, however, not only of the Ohio region but of the far West, is radically different.

That in the western part of the United States, where about two-thirds of the sheep of the country are to be found, the "fine" and "fine medium" wools carry an average charge of at least 11 cents per pound, interest not included.

That if account is taken of the entire wool production of the country, including both fine and coarse wools, the average charge against the clip is about 9½ cents per pound.

That in South America the corresponding charge is between 4 and 5 cents per pound.

That in New Zealand and on the favorably situated runs of Australia it seems clear that at the present range of values for stock—sheep and mutton—the receipts from other sources than wool are carrying the total flock expense. So that taking Australasia as a whole it appears that a charge of a very few cents per pound lies against the great clips of that region in the aggregate. While the board can not, therefore, undertake to name an exact figure in that case, it is certain that the Australasian costs at large fall materially below the South American.

That in the western United States the capitalization per head of sheep (exclusive of land) is \$5.30, upon which a gross profit of 6.2 per cent was realized. The interest rate in that region ranges from 8 to 10 per cent per annum.

That the labor, forage, and necessary miscellaneous expense in the western United States exceed \$2 per head per annum, as against an estimated cost, covering the same elements of expense, of less than \$1 in Australia and about \$1.15 per head in South America.

As shown in this finding of the Tariff Board, no interest on investment, nor wages of the farmer and members of his family, and so forth, were included.

Thus, with South America and Australia having an advantage over the United States in cost of production of from 4½ cents to 5 cents per pound, it can not correctly be maintained that the duty on wool, which, after undervaluations, and so forth, are considered, nets about 4 cents per pound protection, is indefensible.

What will happen to the wool industry when the great wool-producing countries of Argentina and Australia have free access to our markets, with their advantage over us of a lower cost of production of from 4½ to 5 cents, is easily imagined.

It will be noted from the report of the Tariff Board that the labor, forage, and necessary miscellaneous expense in the western United States exceed \$2 per head per annum, as against an estimated cost, covering the same elements of expense, of less than \$1 in Australia and about \$1.15 in South America.

In his speech on August 2, defending the pending tariff bill, the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] said that it is growing more and more expensive to run sheep in the West, because of the narrowing of the range, and I agree with him.

The woolgrowers, therefore, can not reduce the forage expense in order to compete with Australia and South America, and I know they are averse to reducing the wages of their employees; so it will only be left for them to follow the advice of some of the advocates of the free-wool idea, and that is to get out of the wool-growing business.

AUSTRALASIA AND ARGENTINA A MENACE.

In the Washington Post of July 18, 1912, there appeared a brief cable message from Melbourne, Australia, which to me was the most significant item of news in the paper. It was as follows:

MELBOURNE, July 12.

The Right Hon. James Bryce, British Ambassador at Washington, speaking at a banquet at the Chamber of Commerce last night, said there was a great prospect of a substantial reduction in the American tariff. One of the first items, he said, was likely to be that in regard to wool. He would not be surprised if quite a substantial reduction were made, which would increase considerably the volume of the Australian exports to the United States.

It is needless for me to say that former Ambassador Bryce is one of the keenest observers of political affairs in the world, and perhaps more accurate than any other man in public life in determining what the effect will be of any given political or economic cause.

When he says that if a substantial reduction were made in the tariff on wool it would increase considerably the volume of Australian exports to the United States, he states with unerring precision the results which would follow the annihilation of tariff on wool proposed in the pending bill.

The results would be increased importation of wool from Australia into the United States. The same cause which would enable Australia to increase its wool shipments to the United States would enable South America to do exactly the same thing.

The wool clip of the world for 1912 was as follows:

	Pounds.
United States	302,343,400
British America	11,210,000
Mexico and Central America	8,000,000
South America	554,622,955
Europe	814,077,011
Asia	273,146,000
Africa	174,919,000
Australasia	832,861,846
Total, world	2,971,180,212

The number of sheep in the world, according to the most recent available statistics and estimates, is as follows:

United States	52,836,168
Canada, Mexico, etc.	6,211,512
Argentina, Uruguay, etc.	109,693,142
Europe	179,516,437
Asia	110,058,874
Africa	51,429,279
Australasia	117,026,774
Total	626,772,186

The countries producing vastly more wool than they use are Argentina, with a clip last year of 368,151,500 pounds; Uruguay, 138,332,375 pounds; and Australia and New Zealand, 832,861,846 pounds. These are the wool-producing countries of the world where the industry can increase beyond their present production. These are the countries waiting eagerly to furnish wool to the United States as soon as our own industry is crippled or destroyed by the elimination of the protective tariff.

Australasia is in the market to sell nearly all of the wool raised. Thus, in 1912 the production was 832,861,846 pounds; the amount exported practically the same.

Argentina also is a big wool producer and a small consumer. Practically the entire clip of Argentina is exported. The exports for 1909, the latest year on which the Tariff Board gives figures, aggregated 353,362,000 pounds, nearly the entire clip of the country. The exports for 1912 amounted, according to the Annual Wool Review, to practically the entire clip, which was 368,151,500 pounds.

Thus we have two great woolgrowing countries—Argentina and Australia—in the market with over a billion pounds of wool, ready to crowd into the United States and capture our home market, which consumes 500,000,000 pounds annually, just as rapidly as our home woolgrowing industry recedes under the loss of the protective duty which stands between it and foreign competition.

Distance of Australasia and Argentina from us forms no protection, for ocean freight rates on wool from Buenos Aires to Boston range from 17½ cents to 23½ cents a hundred pounds.

Rates from Australia to Boston direct are from \$1 to \$1.37½ per hundred pounds.

The average rate from the Rocky Mountain region to Boston is over \$1.75 per hundred pounds.

This, then, is the menace to the woolgrowing industry of this country of this wool-tariff removal. It cuts off the license fee we charge the Australian and Argentinian woolgrowers for doing business in this country, and gives them the opportunity to take advantage of the cheaper labor, lower rate of interest, and more advantageous climatic conditions they enjoy, so that they can, first, undersell our growers and destroy their industry; and, second, secure and hold the wool market of the United States.

If the sacrifice of the woolgrowing industry meant cheaper clothing for the people of the United States, the woolgrowers might submit with patriotic resignation, but those who have observed the effects of tariff reduction know that it does not mean cheaper goods for the consumer.

It will be observed that Mr. Bryce, in his prediction of what will follow tariff reduction, does not include lower prices to the consumer. He does predict that Australia will find a market in the United States for its surplus wool, of which it has over 800,000,000 pounds every year.

It may be contended that our woolgrowing industry has nothing to fear from Australia because the industry in that country is not increasing in proportion to the increase in its population and its industries other than woolgrowing.

While, in fact, the industry in Australia has not kept pace with other industries and population, yet conditions are such that, with the encouragement of having our markets opened to the wool producers of the world, the Australia wool industry can immediately take great strides forward.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. WARREN. I do.

Mr. PITTMAN. The rates that the Senator from Wyoming has given are the rates of transportation by water from Australia and Argentina to the coast points of the United States, I assume?

Mr. WARREN. Yes.

Mr. PITTMAN. And the rates from the interior of the United States to the same coast points of the United States?

Mr. WARREN. As taken from certain railroad points.

Mr. PITTMAN. Has the Senator from Wyoming the rates from the interior points in Australia to the seaport points in Australia, and from the interior points in Argentina to the shipping points in Argentina?

Mr. WARREN. I understand perfectly what the Senator desires to get at. Of course, there is there no regular rate from all the different points on a few sacks here and a few sacks there from the interior any more than there is here; but let me say that I have given that matter a good deal of attention. I find that in Australia, with its many seacoast points and streams that are navigable for flatboats and rafting, its wool can be gotten to water cheaper than our wool can be gotten to the railroad, because here sheep are in those sections away from the towns and generally pretty far from railroads, and there is a very large expense in getting wool by wagon haul from the shearing pens to the railroad. So I have offset one with the other.

Mr. PITTMAN. Has the Senator any figures on that?

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I have spent hours figuring on it, but, as I have stated, there has to be a difference in the rates from each shearing pen, perhaps, and from each farm. So it is difficult to arrive at anything but an average.

Mr. PITTMAN. Do not the great ranges of Australia and Argentina bear the same relation to their shipping ports as do the ranges of the West to the shipping ports of the United States?

Mr. WARREN. They do not.

Mr. PITTMAN. Why not?

Mr. WARREN. Because the interior of Australia is not settled up, as is the interior of the United States.

Mr. PITTMAN. How does that affect transportation?

Mr. WARREN. Well, it is because there the sheep are raised not so far away from the water shipping points, while here they are raised in the very central and interior part of the country.

Mr. PITTMAN. If the Senator will permit me on that point, before we go any further I will say that the Tariff Board seems to differ with the Senator.

Mr. WARREN. Let me say that I do not want to be put in the position of differing with the Tariff Board, and am not going to be. There are different statements in their report which should be considered together and not in pieces and apart, and I happen to remember that the Senator from Nevada, although his argument yesterday was largely—yes, almost entirely—based upon the report of the Tariff Board, expressed complete disagreement with it, and said it was a partisan board and that he could not depend upon it. In fact, he discredited it.

Mr. PITTMAN. If the Senator will recollect, I said that in all of their mistakes they erred in favor of a high protective tariff.

Mr. WARREN. And I do not agree with that. I remember that they were a bipartisan board, and while it is the Senator's privilege to say that they made a report from a high protective standpoint, it is equally mine to say that they did not.

Mr. PITTMAN. If the Senator please, I will read from the Tariff Board report, page 333, what is said about the ranges so far as markets are concerned in Australia and the United States. They discuss the fact that in Australia they do not ship much mutton to market on account of the remoteness of the sheep runs from the seacoast ports, while in the United States, by reason of the transportation facilities in the interior, we ship a great deal of mutton. Here is the language of the report:

The fact that the average investment in the flock is lower in Australia and in South America than in the United States is due to the greater average distance of the sheep runs from the market.

Mr. WARREN. Well, that is true; they are farther from Boston than we are.

Mr. PITTMAN. They are farther from their local market.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator speaks of the distance of the sheep runs from the market. Perhaps the Senator will not remember—he is a younger man than I am—but I can remember when it was unsafe to ship more than one full car of sheep into the Chicago market. There was no great market until we got down to Buffalo or Albany. It is only within a short time that there has been a market for shipping frozen meat—and that is the only way it can be shipped from Australia—but that business is now being carried on very extensively. I have some quotations here from the Tariff Board report as to Australia which I will put in the Record.

Mr. WALSH. Will the Senator from Wyoming permit me to interrupt him?

Mr. WARREN. Certainly.

Mr. WALSH. I have had no desire in connection with any participation on my part in this debate other than to assist in eliciting actual facts. I can speak with some degree of familiarity with the conditions in my State, and there the shearing pens are, with very rare exceptions, at the railroad points.

Mr. WARREN. I am quite well acquainted with the conditions in Montana.

Mr. WALSH. I should like to inquire of the Senator if they are different in his State.

Mr. WARREN. I will say to the Senator that he is quite right so far as a good portion of his State is concerned. Montana is favored with a great many transcontinental railway lines; she is pretty well gridironed with railroads; and in that country they handle sheep differently. They handle them largely in wagon camps, do they not, and from wagon camps?

Mr. WALSH. Oh, yes.

Mr. WARREN. Of course, they take their wagons, their men, and their supplies—at least they heretofore have done so, but they will not hereafter, according to the evidence the Senator has already submitted—and they graze their sheep wherever they may be down to the shearing pens, and therefore are near the railroad. That is not true now in Wyoming to any great extent, because of the settling of the country here and there, and because we have not the railroad facilities which Montana has. What is true of Wyoming is true of some of the other States. There is a large amount of money paid to get wool from the points where it is sheared to the railroads in my State and in some of the other States; but that is not so much true of Montana, where the business is carried on by wagon camps.

Mr. WALSH. Of course, 20 years ago the conditions to which the Senator adverts were quite common. For instance, it was common to haul wool from the Judith Basin to Fort Benton to ship it down the river, a distance of perhaps 150 miles; but those conditions do not exist to-day. The shearing pens, as I have said, are, with very rare exceptions, at or near the railroad stations.

Mr. WARREN. That works both ways, Mr. President. Only 20 years ago we could graze sheep from any part of Wyoming down within 75 miles of Omaha, but we can not graze them now across one State.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. WARREN. I do.

Mr. PITTMAN. I trust the Senator will pardon me for interrupting him again, but the question of freight rates is very important in this consideration. The only freight rates the Senator has really attempted to give us are the freight rates from the seaports of foreign countries to our seaports. We are contending that the transportation from the interior of our country to our own seaports is less, if anything, than the transportation from the interior of other countries to their seaports, by reason of more favorable transportation conditions existing in the United States than in those foreign countries. I will read what the Tariff Board says with regard to this very matter. The Tariff Board, in discussing the reason why in Australia they do not ship mutton, but ship wool—

Mr. WARREN. Would the Senator as soon wait until I reach a little later point in my remarks where what he suggests would relate more clearly to the points I desire to make?

Mr. PITTMAN. It is only three lines.

Mr. WARREN. Very well.

Mr. PITTMAN. The Tariff Board says this:

In Australia the receipts for mutton constitute a much smaller portion of the receipts than from other sources. This is partly due to the fact that the great sheep runs of the interior are unfavorably situated as regards marketing.

I thank the Senator for his courtesy.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I notice that there seems to be quite a silence on the other side concerning the freight rate of 17½ cents to 20 cents from Buenos Aires. I have known it to be less than that. If there is to be continued contention regarding the matter, I shall be glad to get bills of lading and freight bills to show what is really paid for bringing wool from certain points in New Zealand, Australia, and Argentina to the United States. I have seen many of them.

Now, I will make a few comparisons between the conditions in Australia and in our country. They may not be amiss at this point.

The aggregate area of the Australian woolgrowing States is 1,903,731,840 acres.

The aggregate area of the United States, exclusive of Alaska and our insular possessions, is 1,937,144,960 acres.

The Australian Commonwealth is approximately the same size as the United States.

The alienated lands in Australia amount to 130,393,166 acres; the leased lands, 787,211,488 acres; leaving an area of 986,127,186 acres unoccupied.

The alienated and reserved lands in the United States amount to 1,609,754,992 acres, leaving 327,389,968 acres unappropriated and unreserved.

A large part of the 986,127,186 acres of unoccupied land in Australia is suitable for sheep raising.

The Tariff Board, in its exhaustive study of the wool business in Australia, reports (p. 492, Report on Schedule K):

Woolgrowing on inland leaseholds in Australia has often been described as a "gamble" from the financial point of view. Such it must always remain to some extent, but the risks are everywhere being substantially diminished, while the profits continue sufficiently high to stimulate enterprise. The losses caused to the pastoral industry by the great drought which terminated in 1902 have been estimated at \$650,000,000. That disaster taught lessons of prudence which can never be forgotten. The industry is now being worked on safer lines, and the protective measures taken by those engaged in it will soon be strengthened by the Government railway and water-conservation policies. In the opinion of men who have had a long acquaintance with the industry, Australia should ultimately be capable of carrying at least 150,000,000 sheep, while providing for a greatly increased export of mutton.

With an area of unoccupied land of over 900,000,000 of acres open for the extension of the sheep-raising industry; with a labor cost of \$1 per head of sheep against \$2 per head in the United States; with a cost of from 4½ to 5 cents less per pound for growing wool than in the United States; with the great market of this country of over 500,000,000 pounds per annum opened invitingly to the foreign woolgrower; and with a government administration friendly and helpful instead of hostile to the industry, we may well believe with Mr. Bryce that the volume of Australian exports to the United States will be greatly increased.

The production of wool in Australia, while not keeping pace with the population growth, has nevertheless been steadily increasing during the last decade.

In 1903 the production in the Australian States aggregated 414,120,567 pounds; in 1912 it was 662,845,907 pounds.

In 1903 the number of sheep in the Australian States was 56,932,705; in 1911-12 the number was 92,742,034.

It is generally asserted that the woolgrowing industry of South America has reached its apex and that we have nothing to fear from competition from that source. The wool production of the two great South American woolgrowing countries, Argentina and Uruguay, has not increased in proportion to the increase in their population or in proportion to increases in agricultural industries other than woolgrowing. But Argentina is preparing to take advantage of the opportunities for increased trade and profits which will be offered through the removal of the duty on wools sent to the United States. For some time past the Government of Argentina has been offering liberal inducements to stockmen to go into the sheep business in Patagonia.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I understood the Senator from Wyoming to state that the cost of producing wool in Australia and in other foreign countries was less than in the United States.

Mr. WARREN. The cost of labor, certainly.

Mr. PITTMAN. That the net charge against wool is less in those countries than in the United States; is that correct?

Mr. WARREN. Yes.

Mr. PITTMAN. The Tariff Board—

Mr. WARREN. I remember the figures the Senator gave yesterday from the Tariff Board report, which, by the way, he discredited; and if he will remember or will look over his speech, he himself brought the figures in, showing that it cost \$2 or more per head in this country, if I mistake not, to about a dollar in other countries.

Mr. PITTMAN. The Tariff Board, on page 330, in Table 10, gives the net charge for producing wool in the State of Washington at one-half a cent a pound. On page 11 it gives the net charge for producing wool in the Argentine Republic at from 4 to 5 cents a pound.

Mr. WARREN. What figures does it give for Australia?

Mr. PITTMAN. In Australia it is a few cents a pound.

Mr. WARREN. I beg the Senator's pardon. In another place he will find that it is stated that in Australia they raise sheep at a profit of quite a few cents each without considering the wool at all.

Mr. PITTMAN. With the Senator's permission, I will read the extracts from the Tariff Board report to which I refer. The Tariff Board says:

That in South America the corresponding charge is between 4 and 5 cents per pound.

That in New Zealand and on the favorably—

Note the word "favorably"—

situated runs of Australia it seems clear that at the present range of values for stock sheep and mutton the receipts from other sources than wool are carrying the total flock expense. So that, taking Australasia as a whole, it appears that a charge of a very few cents per pound lies against the great clips of that region in the aggregate.

Mr. WARREN. Well, what does that prove? Does that prove that the cost is less in this country than it is over there?

Mr. PITTMAN. It proves that they are producing wool in the State of Washington for less than they are producing it in Australia or in Argentina.

Mr. WARREN. How much do they produce in Washington? Mr. PITTMAN. They have in Washington about 1,150,000 sheep.

Mr. WARREN. Oh, no, they have not nearly so many sheep as the Senator from Nevada claims. How much wool do they produce?

Mr. PITTMAN. I will give you the exact amount. The figures given were for Nevada.

Mr. SMOOT. They have 61,574 sheep, and the total amount of wool is valued at \$46,540.70. The Senator compares that one State, where sheep are raised for mutton only, with the average of the sheep produced in Australia.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, if I may continue for just a minute—

Mr. WARREN. While the Senator is looking at the figures, let me say that the State of Washington has comparatively a mere handful of sheep, the long-wool sheep raised for mutton, as he proved yesterday; while Australasia has nearly 120,000,000 sheep.

Mr. WALSH, Mr. PITTMAN and Mr. SMOOT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield, and to whom?

Mr. WARREN. I can not yield to all three Senators at once. I will ask that I may be allowed to finish this part of my remarks.

A comparison with a little handful of sheep in one little part of the United States, in Washington, where they raise a mutton sheep, hardly elucidates the proposition of our wool supply as a whole, which goes up into the hundreds of millions of pounds.

Another thing: While the Senator from Nevada is quoting Washington, perhaps he will quote Ohio, where the wool costs 19 cents per pound according to the authority from which he is quoting.

Mr. PITTMAN. I am willing to draw a distinction between Ohio and the other States, and the Senator knows it. The Tariff Board states, with regard to the Middle States and Eastern States, that it is an entirely different matter from the ranging of sheep through the West, where the product is chiefly wool.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator will find in the same computation that it costs 12 cents and a fraction in Wyoming, if I remember rightly, and 11 cents in another western State, and so on.

Mr. PITTMAN. Yes; and it also shows the reason why in the computation. The reason given for that by the board is set out in the report. For instance, the State of Nevada raises its wool, as given by the Tariff Board report, at 4.1 cents a pound for the wool. That is less than it costs to raise it in South America. It is certainly only a few cents a pound in Australia; and it can not be contended that the manner of raising sheep in the State of Nevada is any different from the manner of raising of sheep in either Utah or Wyoming.

Mr. WARREN. I wish to say to the Senator from Nevada that I welcome all inquiries; but since nearly all of that matter was put before the Senate yesterday, I do not believe I wish to take in all of the Tariff Board report, especially as the Senator does not make the point he is trying to make, that we can raise sheep cheaper in this country than they can in Australia.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. WARREN. The Senator from Montana first rose, Mr. President. I yield to him.

Mr. WALSH. I rose simply to say that there ought to be no controversy about an indisputable fact, namely, that Washington has 501,000 sheep rather than 62,000, as suggested by the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wyoming now yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. WARREN. I do, with pleasure.

Mr. SMOOT. The report was based upon the number of sheep I stated. The number of sheep reported upon was 61,574.

Mr. WALSH. With the usual accuracy of the Senator from Utah, I felt sure that he misspoke.

Mr. SMOOT. Of course if I did, I wish to say to the Senator that I had reference to the number of sheep that were reported upon, showing that the cost of wool upon that number of sheep was what the Senator from Nevada said. Right in that connection I wish to say that nearly the whole difference between the average cost of producing wool, of 9½ cents a pound, as the Tariff Board says, and that of a half cent in Washington, comes from the fact that they report 92.3 per cent as the percentage of increase of lambs in Washington. It was on that small number of sheep that they reported, and the class of sheep

which the Senator knows, perhaps, were kept around the home, where the increase of lambs would be very much larger than the increase of lambs in any herd of sheep that may have run upon the range.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I do not think the Senator is intentionally unfair when he keeps referring to the small number of sheep that were considered in the State of Washington. As a matter of fact, the same proportion of sheep were considered in the State of Washington that were considered in the State of Utah, or the State of Wyoming, or any other State. In other words, about 10 per cent of the sheep of each State were used as an example for all.

Mr. SMOOT. More than 10 per cent of the sheep in Utah were reported on, and less than 10 per cent, we will say, of the whole, because the number of sheep reported upon is 3,151,731, and there are over 50,000,000 sheep in this country. So the Senator must admit that not as many as 10 per cent were reported upon in all of the States of the Union.

Mr. PITTMAN. Again the Senator is unfair, because the sheep they examined were the sheep in the Western States, which constitute only from 35,000,000 to 39,000,000, instead of 50,000,000. My statement that 10 per cent were selected as an example of the whole is correct.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the number reported upon is as I say. Of course the States are named here in the report. I wish to say that it seems to me the Senator had better not talk about unfairness, when he tries to give the Senate to understand that the cost of producing wool in this country is the cost of producing it in Washington, and then compares it, not with the lowest cost of wool in Australia or in South America, but with the average cost in Australia and the average cost in South America.

The Tariff Board reports that in Australia there are millions of sheep as to which there can be no charge whatever against the wool, as the furnishing of lambs and mutton from the herds more than pays all the expenses of maintaining the sheep. Therefore I say to the Senator that if he is going to pick out Washington, the State of lowest cost, and give figures based on the wool produced from 61,000 sheep, it seems to me he also ought to take the lowest cost of the millions of sheep in Australia.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wyoming further yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. WARREN. I do.

Mr. PITTMAN. I shall try not to interfere any more; but I think the Senator from Utah is again unintentionally unfair in stating that in the State of Washington they probably went into somebody's back yard and examined one little herd. As a matter of fact, there is a diagram in this report which, if the Senator had read it—and I know he has read it—shows that the examination in the State of Washington was as universal as it was anywhere else. If he will look at the map, he will see that they went all over the sheep area in making their examination, and the same way in the State of Nevada.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, if we are talking about the products of the whole world I think we would better not get down into any back yard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wyoming decline to yield further?

Mr. WARREN. I understood the Senator was through. I did not wish to cut off the Senator.

Mr. PITTMAN. I simply wish to say that the reasons given by the Tariff Board, as I stated on yesterday, for the difference in the net charge against raising wool in the Western States, are given in this language, which I think will be accepted even by the Senator from Utah:

The wide variation from Table XIII to Table XVIII in the net charge against wool depends in the main upon certain conditions which have already been discussed—the particular sort of flock kept, whether crossbred or pure wool; whether woolgrowing is combined with breeding; the importance for different purposes of the annual increase of lambs; the extent to which wethers are kept; the amount and quality of wool produced, and the methods employed in the farm operations.

Since the only source of regular income from wethers is wool and the costs of maintenance are not materially lower than for breeding ewes, it is evident that though the fleece of the wethers may be superior to that of the ewes the higher the proportion of wethers in a flock the greater is likely to be the net charge against wool, since under the conditions now prevailing in this region, the tables indicate that the fleece of a sheep alone does not pay for its maintenance.

An examination of that table will show that the trouble with Wyoming and the other States is that they are not pursuing the raising of sheep in accordance with the practical conditions of that country and in accordance with this suggestion of the Tariff Board.

Mr. WARREN. There are men in Wyoming who have been there longer than the Senator from Nevada has, who have been

in the business of raising sheep for a great many years; and while doubtless he can show them all about how to raise sheep, I do not believe we can quite go into all the elementaries of it here this afternoon.

Mr. PITTMAN. Just one more question, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wyoming further yield?

Mr. WARREN. I yield.

Mr. PITTMAN. I certainly respect the great experience of the Senator from Wyoming. I know he has had a great deal of experience in this matter. But I wish to say that his experience has been largely that of a seller, while my experience has been entirely that of a buyer. His experience has been under a high protective tariff, where all kinds of extravagance are encouraged, upon which the Tariff Board comments. My experience has been in a case where we want some economy in the industry, and not to have it run as a luxury for the producer.

Mr. WARREN. All that, of course, is declamation. I have been in the industry, it is true. I have been in it in the low times as well as in the high times, under free trade as well as under protection. I do not make any denial of that. It is one of the things in which I am interested, and my interest may or may not be a matter of common knowledge. I do not have to apologize for it.

We were speaking of Argentina a time ago. I have here a quotation from the Salt Lake City Tribune of August 4, 1913. I happen to have met the gentleman, who was interested in advertising, or, in a way, exploiting, the ranges of South America. The Government over there, as I understand, requested from our Government the loan, if I may use the term, of an expert who went over there and examined into the conditions of all matters relating to sheep husbandry. Upon his return he was interviewed, and I suppose this is one of the interviews:

[By International News Service.]

SAYS PATAGONIA IS GREAT SHEEP REGION—PROF. BAILEY WILLIS RETURNS FROM SOUTH AMERICA FOR SHORT VACATION.

NEW YORK, August 3.

Prof. Bailey Willis, who was loaned to the Argentine Government two and a half years ago by the United States Geological Bureau to conduct a survey of the Andes and Patagonia, arrived to-day on board the steamer *Voltaire* for a vacation. He will return at the end of the year to complete the work.

During the two and a half years the party of which he had charge surveyed in detail 20,000 square miles of unexplored territory and mapped out railroad routes for the development of the country, which will be built by British capitalists and the Argentine Government.

Besides the planning of railroad routes the expedition was commissioned to determine the resources of the treeless plains of Patagonia and the forested valleys of the Andes. Prof. Willis declared that Patagonia, which was no farther from Buenos Aires than Colorado is from Chicago, would become the greatest sheep-rearing region of the world, while the Andes would be one of the greatest cattle-raising districts.

The woolgrowing business of South America, while it has not grown as rapidly as other industries, shows an increase.

In 1896 the South American production was 473,763,540 pounds; in 1912, 554,062,955 pounds.

Of the production a large percentage is exported. For instance, of the Argentina clip of 340,400,000 pounds in 1910, 327,200,000 pounds were exported; and of the Uruguay clip of 126,800,000 pounds in 1910, 124,300,000 pounds were exported.

A conclusion of the Tariff Board is that the production of sheep in the principal South American sheep countries may remain more or less stationary because the expected increase in the Patagonian region will be offset by the absorption of lands for agricultural purposes in the central provinces; but it is also asserted that the business may increase with higher profits, and this is just what it is proposed to give them by the present bill. In competition with our wool industry Argentina and Uruguay can produce wool at from 4½ to 5 cents per pound less than the United States.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I should like to ask what is the character of the wool grown in Patagonia?

Mr. WARREN. It is a very excellent quality, usually what is called "cross-bred" wool.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It is the wool that goes into carpets?

Mr. WARREN. Not at all. It is that which goes into such articles as the coat I have on, and it can be transported to New York or Boston for 1 to 1½ cents per pound less than from the Rocky Mountain country, making a difference of at least 5 to 6 cents per pound of scoured wool.

We have protected our growers heretofore with a duty which has given the market to our home growers. As soon as the duty is removed we must come into competition with the wools of lower cost of production in South America, and if our wool-growers can not live under this competition they can take the advice of those who advocate free wool, go out of business, and allow the wool we use to be supplied from South America and Australia.

Possibly at the risk of repetition I would say that the report of the Tariff Board shows that woolgrowing in Argentina has been falling off slightly in the past two or three years. The Government of the country proposes, however, to aid in not only bringing woolgrowing back to its previous basis, but extending and enlarging it to a very great degree. This is to be accomplished by leasing great tracts of public lands in Patagonia belonging to Argentina. Steps have already been taken to lease these areas of public land, and on May 14, 1912, the minister of agriculture of Argentina authorized the issuance of invitations in the United States and other countries to rent the public lands in the territories of Rio Negro, Chubut, and Santa Cruz for sheep raising. It is proposed to lease the lands at an annual rental of \$84 a square league, equal to 6,144 acres, and for a term of 30 years. This would be at the rate of about 1½ cents per acre per annum. In our Western States where State lands are leased to sheepmen the annual rate of rental is from 5 to 20 cents per acre.

It is represented by the minister of agriculture of Argentina that Patagonia is primarily a sheep and cattle country, where agriculture must always be subordinate. The climate is semi-arid. Rio Negro is in the latitude corresponding to South Dakota, Chubut corresponds to Montana, and Santa Cruz to the equivalent latitudes of Canada; but the extremes of cold are not so great in Patagonia as in the States referred to.

The altitude varies from sea level to 4,000 feet in the plateaus and 6,000 feet in mountain peaks. The country looks like the high plains of Wyoming, Utah, Arizona, or Texas.

The pasture consists of native bunch grasses and many kinds of edible bushes. Water occurs in springs, streams, waterholes, and underground, but is wanting in some districts except when it rains. Its distribution is the controlling factor in regard to the value of lands. There are well-watered protected valleys, plains with numerous transient ponds, high plateaus with water and pasture spring and autumn, and other districts where water is very scarce or salt. It is the purpose of the Argentine minister to subdivide the public lands so as to include under each lease lands of different kinds comprising ranges for different seasons, where practicable in one fence, or in lots within driving distance.

Wool on the ranch sells for 7½ to 9½ cents per pound. Labor is about one-half the rate paid in this country, being \$16 to \$25 per month for the herders.

It is estimated by the minister of agriculture that a net income of 17 per cent per annum on the amount invested can be realized by investors in sheep raising in Patagonia under the terms offered by the Government.

It is expected also that the arrangement will in a short time double the area of lands now devoted to sheep growing and will greatly increase the wool production of the country.

TARIFF DUTIES PAID BY FOREIGNER.

Mr. President, we have heard frequently from the supporters of this bill that the wool tariff imposes a hardship on the many for the benefit of the few.

Now, we contend that the duty paid on importations of wool comes largely out of the pocket of the foreign producer as his license for trading in our market, and does not come out of the pocket of the consumer.

But if the contention of the other side were correct, what is the extent of the burden imposed on the people of the country by the imposition of a tariff on wool?

The aggregate amount of duties collected during the last fiscal year on unmanufactured wool was \$14,454,234. We have 93,402,000 people in the United States, or probably more than that now, which would make the figures more favorable. Therefore, if the people paid this duty the amount for each individual for the fiscal year 1912 was between 15 and 16 cents.

The amount of duties collected on manufactures of wool was \$12,599,246, and if this was paid by the American people the average payment per individual for 1912 was 13 cents. If the entire duty collected on wool and manufactures of wool were paid by the people of this country the burden for the last fiscal year would have been less than 29 cents per person.

No matter who paid the duty, foreigner or American, the amount collected finally went into the hands of the people of this country, as it was paid out to maintain our Government institutions.

I contend, Mr. President, that the \$27,053,480 collected last year in wool and wool manufactures duty was a tax paid by the foreign producer for the privilege of entering our markets and that it was a benefit rather than a burden on our own people.

MAGNITUDE OF INDUSTRY THREATENED.

Mr. President, in conclusion I wish to call attention briefly to the magnitude of this sheep and wool industry, the existence of which is threatened by this bill.

The latest obtainable statistics show:

	Pounds.
Total number of sheep in world.....	626,872,774
Total number of sheep in United States (or about one-twelfth of the whole number).....	52,823,168
Total wool production of world.....	2,971,180,132
Total wool production of United States (or about one-tenth of the whole production).....	302,343,400
Total wool consumption of United States (over one-sixth of the product of the world).....	500,000,000

The United States uses more wool than any other nation in the world.

Touching the importance of woolgrowing in our country with which to supply our mills, I quote the following from the report of the Revenue Commission appointed in 1865 to consider and report upon our entire revenue system; not as a wool commission, but to consider our entire revenue system. The members of the commission personally were not particularly interested in woolgrowing or manufacturing, but in the exhaustive report they made the following was included:

The home production of wool is necessary to render us properly independent of foreign powers, in peace and in war, in obtaining our supplies of an article on which the lives and health of all of our people depend. It is necessary to national economy, for no great agricultural country can afford to import its most important and costly raw material.

And—

Finally, it is necessary to extend and complete the circle of diversified industries on which the wealth and independence of nations so much depend.

It would be a sad condition for our country, and especially in time of war, if we were dependent upon foreign countries for that most needed, if contraband, article—wool for clothes—which, next to food, is our most essential product.

SUGGESTED TARIFF ACTION.

Mr. President, I suggest:

First. The Government is ours, and must be supported, and it takes cash to support the Government.

Second. The best way to obtain it is to make the foreigner pay a license for the privilege of doing business in this country.

Third. The laborer is worthy of his hire, and we must give protection sufficient to insure work for all who are willing to work and wages sufficiently large to pay for food, clothing, and the education of children, with a little laid by for sickness or a rainy day. This insurance we must sustain for all of our millions of working men and women.

Fourth. The amount of revenue from wool duties is large; the per capita or per-suit-of-clothing wool duty is almost infinitesimal, since but 2 to 4 pounds of clean wool go into a suit of clothes.

Fifth. Cost of living will greatly increase because of higher meat prices if our mutton supply is lessened, just as meat will be lower if we increase that supply.

Sixth. Diversified interests—agricultural and manufacturing—are vital to the progress and high development of the nation.

Seventh. Practically all of the people of this country are producers; every man who works is one. All are consumers; but those who are consumers and not producers are the "idle rich," who need not be taken into account.

Mr. President, I can recall no period but one in our history when so determined an effort was made to cripple the industries of this country and transfer them to foreign countries as will, in the opinion of thousands of good citizens, be the result of the operations of the pending bill should it be enacted as reported from the Finance Committee. That period was during colonial times, when even then England was jealous of us on account of our industrial and commercial growth.

It was in that period that Parliament in 1699 enacted a law prohibiting the exportation of wool or woollen manufactures from the English Colonies in America in competition with those of the mother country. It was in that period that Lord Chat-ham is quoted as saying:

The English colonists in North America have no right to manufacture a nail or horseshoe.

In 1719 the House of Commons enacted in resolution form "that erecting any manufactories in the Colonies tended to lessen their dependence upon Great Britain."

Can it be possible that this great political party which now has full control of the executive and legislative branches of the Government will, unwittingly or otherwise, by reason of this tariff legislation it has determined to adopt, turn us backward toward conditions which prevailed in colonial days when we were at the mercy of the manufacturing and business interests of England?

Mr. President, our country is prosperous. Daily we have statements to that effect from Senators on the other side and we have evidence of the correctness of their statements in the Government reports of the volume of imports and exports of merchandise for the fiscal year just ended. These reports show

that our commercial transactions are greater in volume than ever before in our history.

These conditions, I firmly believe, are the result of the policy of protection which has been in force the past 16 years.

Mr. STONE obtained the floor.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey in the chair). Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. STONE. I rose only to express the hope that we might proceed with the bill.

Mr. PENROSE. I thought I would indulge in a few reflections on the bill, Mr. President.

Mr. STONE. We are always delighted to hear the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield, then, to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. STONE. I yield the floor, Mr. President.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] has given a most interesting and luminous address to the Senate, very naturally largely from the point of view of the woolgrowers. In the remarks I shall make I propose more particularly to direct the attention of the Senate to the view of the manufacturer, particularly the eastern manufacturer, in the woolen industry. At the same time I wish to impress upon the Senate the fact that as far as the eastern point of view is concerned, as I know it, there is no conflict with the side of the woolgrower.

This is an industry which covers a continent, beginning with the growing of wool on the larger scale in the western part of the country and ending with the manufactures of the eastern seaboard. But we must not underrate the fact that not only is the industry one harmonious proposition from the wool on the sheep's back to the mill, and any comprehensive tariff must necessarily embrace the whole situation, but in addition to that, the eastern part of our country must not be overlooked as a woolgrowing section.

I have some figures here which are quite remarkable, showing the wool product of the United States for the year 1912. It may not be realized that Maine produced 937,500 pounds of wool in that year. Ohio produced 16,875,000 pounds of wool, nearly half the product of Montana and nearly half the product of Wyoming, showing that it is not alone the wide areas of the West which are interested in woolgrowing, but that the great Eastern States have a real interest in it.

The industry of woolgrowing is necessarily being curtailed in the western country. The establishment of the forest reserves and the restrictions imposed upon them, the fencing in of the country, have all contributed to curtail the industry to some extent. On the other hand, it has been slowly but steadily increasing east of the Mississippi River. There are large stretches of country in States like Ohio and Pennsylvania that are even better adapted to the growing of wool and the raising of sheep than the country along the slopes of the Rocky Mountain Range. Unless this industry is destroyed by the pending tariff legislation, we can well look in the next 10 years to a most remarkable increase in the raising of sheep east of the Mississippi River. The raising of sheep for food and for the fleece ought to be a part of the industry of every large farm. The State of Michigan, I find from these figures, produced 10,125,000 pounds of wool during 1912. The State of Pennsylvania produced in the same year 4,095,000 pounds of wool. At one time the county of Washington, in Pennsylvania, ranked as the leading woolgrowing county in all the United States, and it is still a substantial part of the agricultural wealth of the people of that great section of southwestern Pennsylvania.

The table referred to is as follows:

Wool products (washed and unwashed) of the United States, 1912.

	Pounds.
United States	304,043,400
Maine	937,500
New Hampshire	214,500
Vermont	607,500
Massachusetts	143,750
Rhode Island	30,000
Connecticut	85,500
New York	3,750,000
New Jersey	21,800
Pennsylvania	4,095,000
Delaware	26,500
Maryland	729,800
Virginia	2,025,000
West Virginia	3,162,500
North Carolina	562,500
South Carolina	108,000
Georgia	656,250
Florida	308,750
Ohio	16,875,000
Indiana	5,280,000
Illinois	4,556,250
Michigan	10,125,000
Wisconsin	4,290,000

Wool products (washed and unwashed), etc.—Continued.

	Pounds.
Minnesota	3,037,500
Iowa	5,737,500
Missouri	7,425,000
North Dakota	1,750,000
South Dakota	3,206,250
Nebraska	1,700,000
Kansas	1,575,000
Kentucky	3,565,000
Tennessee	1,900,000
Alabama	373,750
Mississippi	562,500
Louisiana	525,000
Texas	9,100,000
Oklahoma	390,000
Arkansas	400,000
Montana	31,175,000
Wyoming	32,175,000
Colorado	8,040,000
New Mexico	18,850,000
Arizona	5,695,000
Utah	11,550,000
Nevada	5,775,000
Idaho	15,540,000
Washington	3,600,000
Oregon	18,270,000
California	11,900,000

Mr. JAMES. Will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield for a question?

Mr. PENROSE. Yes.

Mr. JAMES. How many pounds of wool does the Senator say Pennsylvania produced last year?

Mr. PENROSE. Four million and ninety-five thousand pounds.

Mr. JAMES. How many pounds did Pennsylvania produce in 1909?

Mr. PENROSE. I could not answer that question.

Mr. JAMES. I will state to the Senator that the figures supplied us by the census show that Pennsylvania produced in 1909 6,300,000 pounds of wool. If the figures the Senator now gives to the Senate as to the production of wool in Pennsylvania last year are correct, Pennsylvania has fallen off one-third in the production of wool.

Mr. PENROSE. The Senator is entirely correct in that statement. Washington County, to which I have referred, with the neighboring county of Greene, which are the chief centers of the wool industry in Pennsylvania, have exhibited a falling off. It is due to two reasons. One has been the development of great natural resources, like the discovery of oil and natural gas and the establishment of great industrial plants, which have caused many of the farmers to abandon their farms, or to lease them partly unworked, and in recent times—in the last two years—the persistent agitation for free wool and tariff reduction, which has terrified everyone engaged in the industry. But, notwithstanding these circumstances, the industry in Pennsylvania is quite a substantial one and of material interest to the agricultural people of that great Commonwealth. There is no section of the State where the people are more gravely disturbed regarding this tariff bill than are the farmers of the counties of Washington and Greene in the State of Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALSH. I should like to address a question to the Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. PENROSE. I will.

Mr. WALSH. Can the Senator tell us the number of sheep there are in Pennsylvania at the present time?

Mr. PENROSE. Yes; I am going to get to that, if the Senator will wait for a minute.

Mr. WALSH. Can the Senator give us the figures for 1899?

Mr. PENROSE. No; I did not want to burden the Senate with too many figures.

Mr. WALSH. Inasmuch as the Senator has told about how the woolgrowing business is developing east of the Mississippi River, I want to invite his attention to the fact that Indiana in 1899 had 1,200,899 sheep and in 1909 it had 659,802 sheep.

Mr. PENROSE. The Senator is about right, I believe. I have already stated that the industry has gone down. But it is still a vital substantial subject of interest to the farmers of the East.

Mr. JAMES. If the Senator will permit me, in regard to the statement he made, that the falling off in the production of wool in Pennsylvania was due to the development there and in part to the agitation of the Democratic Party for free wool—

Mr. PENROSE. Yes, Mr. President; I know no one in Pennsylvania who argues for free wool.

Mr. JAMES. I thought the Senator attributed the falling off of the production of the wool to the agitation about free wool.

Mr. PENROSE. Partly that and partly—

Mr. JAMES. I was wondering whether in 1911, when we passed through the House a bill that had a tariff upon wool,

that affected the people of Pennsylvania so quickly as to be reflected in the production of wool in 1912.

Mr. PENROSE. I can answer the Senator very briefly. The tariff was so low as to be inconsequential, and the provisions of the bill regarding the manufactured product were so destructive, that it was evident to everyone that there would not be any market for wool if the bill passed.

Mr. JAMES. The Tariff Board report, however, does not agree with the Senator as to why the production of wool has fallen off in Pennsylvania, because this report says:

The production of early lambs is found profitable in New Jersey at the present time, as it is in eastern Pennsylvania. In these regions woolgrowing is a matter subordinated to mutton production.

Mr. PENROSE. That may be entirely correct. Pennsylvania is quite a large territory, divided into the west and the eastern parts by the Allegheny Mountains. The chief section of the State where sheep are raised is west of the Allegheny Mountains, and I was referring to the western section of the State.

Mr. JAMES. I thought the Senator was talking about the State as a whole.

Mr. PENROSE. Then I failed to make myself clear. I was talking about the State as a whole, but I stated, as regards the very large production of the sheep industry, that it is located in the western part of the State. It may be that on the dairy farms and the farms in the eastern part of the State near the great centers sheep are raised for meat.

Regarding the sheep condition in Pennsylvania I can say that the State of Pennsylvania, like most of the States east of the Mississippi River, does not now possess so many sheep as it once had because of the favorable conditions for woolgrowing on the wide grazing areas of the far West and the Rocky Mountains and on account of industrial development. But Washington County and other counties in Pennsylvania are still famous for the quality of their sheep and wool, and there were, all told, 650,000 sheep of shearing age in Pennsylvania on April 1, 1912. The average weight of the fleece of these sheep in that year was 6.30 pounds, and the total clip of wool, washed and unwashed, for 1912 was 4,095,000 pounds, equivalent to 2,170,350 pounds of scoured wool, of an average value in 1912 of 54 cents a pound, almost the highest price commanded anywhere in the United States. The total value of the Pennsylvania clip of 1912 was \$1,171,989. Our clip was 60 per cent fine and 40 per cent medium, corresponding in that regard with the famous clip of our neighboring State of Ohio, which had 2,700,000 sheep in 1912, yielding 16,875,000 pounds of wool, washed and unwashed, equivalent to 8,606,250 pounds of scoured wool, selling, as our Pennsylvania clip did, for 54 cents a scoured pound and bringing a total return of \$4,647,375.

These industries of the farmers of Pennsylvania, Ohio, and our other States are altogether too important to be sacrificed, either by free trade in the wool itself or by the equally certain and even more disastrous result of inadequate duties on the finished woolen fabrics—duties wholly insufficient to cover the difference in wages and cost of production between this country and abroad.

The figures are of some interest, and I will ask to have inserted the international trade in wool during 1911.

The table referred to is as follows:

International trade in wool in 1911.

Country.	Exports.	Imports.
	Pounds.	Pounds.
Algeria.....	15,314,254	
Argentina.....	291,086,566	
Australia.....	710,674,149	
Austria-Hungary.....		65,148,135
Belgium.....	235,209,810	340,039,704
British India.....	62,143,913	22,468,689
British South Africa.....	153,289,110	
Canada.....		6,876,934
Chile.....	23,904,822	
China.....	47,275,467	
France.....	81,886,560	603,730,592
Germany.....	35,581,362	468,711,629
Japan.....		8,323,399
Netherlands.....	21,432,125	29,376,348
New Zealand.....	175,981,629	
Persia.....	10,323,935	
Peru.....	10,426,027	
Russia.....	30,871,677	104,325,654
Spain.....	24,757,321	
Sweden.....		5,791,041
Switzerland.....		11,634,556
Turkey.....	40,156,183	
United Kingdom.....	31,373,218	568,230,493
United States.....		155,922,510
Uruguay.....	103,595,404	
Other countries.....	42,046,000	53,914,000
Total.....	2,147,329,532	2,444,493,684

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. PENROSE. Yes.

Mr. PITTMAN. Does the Senator believe that taking the duty off raw wool would decrease the number of sheep that are naturally raised in his State?

Mr. PENROSE. I believe it would practically obliterate the sheep industry in the section where it is chiefly located. In the southwestern part of the State already the farmers are beginning to get rid of their sheep. While I am not advised as to the present price of wool and how much it has gone down, if any, I know in that section no one wants to own any sheep with this bill hanging over his head.

Mr. PITTMAN. How does the Senator explain this statement of the Tariff Board, found on page 302:

In all the States not included in the western and the Ohio districts the board finds that sheep are maintained primarily, as a rule, for their utility as consumers of forage that would otherwise go largely to waste, for their fertilizing value on the fields and pastures, for the production of market lambs, and only incidentally for their wool.

Mr. PENROSE. The Senator has acquired renewed confidence in the Tariff Board report. Yesterday he was rather disposed to doubt it and ignore it. There is nothing inconsistent in that report and the statement I have made. The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES] raised a similar point. The section of Pennsylvania which is the center of this sheep industry is a part of the Ohio district. Southeastern Ohio and southwestern Pennsylvania are two sections of the eastern part of the United States particularly adapted to the raising of sheep. All the Tariff Board means to say in the report is that in the eastern part of Pennsylvania and other eastern States sheep are raised for the meat. But Pennsylvania comprises a very large territory. A continental mountain range divides the meat proposition from the wool proposition, as far as the sheep industry is concerned.

I merely refer to this interest of the East in woolgrowing because the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] referred to an occasional conflict which had occurred in the past between the grower and the manufacturer. In my opinion there is no real conflict at the present time, and there should never have been a conflict of that character in the past.

As far as the people of Pennsylvania are concerned, the overwhelming majority of them are, as I am, consistent protectionists. They do not believe in spotted protection. They believe in extending to the grower a protective duty which will permit him to continue in his industry, and they believe in similar protective duties on the manufactured products of the East. They do not come here like people have come heretofore asking for free hides and heavy duties on shoes.

I have referred to the fact that the sheep growers of Pennsylvania will view with grave alarm the passage of this measure, and that they are endeavoring to get rid of their stock. The same remark applies with even greater force to the manufacturers east of the Allegheny Mountains and more particularly east of the Susquehanna River. There are grounds for this apprehension. I have here an article from a trade publication, entitled "Men's Wear," under date of June 25, 1913, which I will ask the Secretary to read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

MEN'S WEAR, JUNE 25, 1913.

SOME ADVERTISEMENTS RECENTLY APPEARING IN AN ENGLISH TRADE PUBLICATION.

The following advertisements were recently printed in an English trade journal:

"Englishmen recently returned from America, after careful study of prospects for British ready-to-wear clothing, would like to get in touch with a first-class house making the very best productions only and specializing in overcoats, raincoats, and sporting clothing; also high-grade woolsens, with the view to opening up the American market. Excellent prospects right now to get well in."

"Two young gentlemen, resident in Manchester and shortly leaving for Canada and the United States, are open to represent woolen manufacturers, wholesale clothiers, Bradford goods, general drapery, and men's-year houses."

"Traveler, well acquainted with woolen trade, shortly starting regularly for America, would represent high-class manufacturer. Commission and part expenses."

Mr. PENROSE. I should like to have the Secretary now read from the same trade journal, under date of June 25, 1913, a statement from Mr. Theodore Justice, of Philadelphia, one of the pioneers of the wool manufacturing industry, who is well known all over the United States and who has just returned from Europe.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

MEN'S WEAR, JUNE 25, 1913.

EUROPEAN MANUFACTURERS ELATED.

Theodore Justice, formerly of the firm of Justice, Bateman & Co., wool dealers, writes from Budapest that European woolen manufacturers are elated by the Underwood tariff bill, and if they do not double the size of their mills it will be because they think the new schedule too favorable to last.

Mr. Justice is studying tariff conditions across the water. He gives the opinion that the administration bill removed 80 per cent of protection from American labor employed in woolen mills, to say nothing of the loss to manufacturers. He explains his figures in this way:

Under the Payne law wages at the time of McKinley's inauguration were 40 per cent higher than at the time of McKinley's inauguration, when the Wilson-Gorman tariff law was in effect. The Underwood bill provides 40 per cent less protection to wool labor—not the manufacturer—than the Wilson bill did. Therefore the Underwood bill robs labor of 80 per cent protection."

A west of England cloth manufacturer said to Mr. Justice: "I would give all the markets of the world that I now have in exchange for the American market as it was under the Taft administration. Even with your high tariff my sales to the United States have doubled. If there were any hope that the Underwood bill would last eight years, I would double the size of my mill. The worst of it is that your workmen have votes, and when they are idle in the mills they are busy at the polls. If I did not think there would be a reaction, I would go ahead at full speed. We are surely pleased with what President Wilson and Mr. Underwood have done."

As to European wages, Mr. Justice says: "I find wages in Austria for work similar to that in the United States only 25 per cent of those in the United States; in Belgium and Germany, 33½ per cent; and in Great Britain, 49 per cent. While labor in Hungary receives only one-quarter of what is paid in the United States, commodities are as high. Shoes are dearer and ready-to-wear clothing is about the same as at home under Taft's administration."

A correspondent of the Nottingham Guardian, Nottingham, England, in an article covering the English wool trade, says, in part:

"The ideas of some seem to be in the clouds respecting the likely demand of America for home-grown wools when once the tariff comes into operation, but it certainly will take time before American users adjust themselves to the new conditions. There is every likelihood of very largely increased shipments of semi and fully manufactured textiles being shipped to the United States from West Riding under the proposed new duties, and American manufacturers will have to face very different competition from what they have experienced during the last 15 years."

Mr. STONE. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. PENROSE. I do.

Mr. STONE. Who is the author of the paper just read?

Mr. PENROSE. The author is Mr. Theodore Justice, of Philadelphia. The gentleman who has been interviewed in that report is a man of very high standing and undisputed authority on the wool business.

Mr. STONE. I did not quite catch it.

Mr. PENROSE. Does the Senator want to have the article read over again?

Mr. STONE. No; I was asking the Senator a question about it.

Mr. PENROSE. I can not hear the Senator, and he does not seem to have understood the article.

Mr. STONE. I understood the article to be a statement of some gentleman by the way of interview, or otherwise, favoring the passage of this bill.

Mr. PENROSE. Oh, Mr. President, the Senator is entirely mistaken. If he has sufficient interest in the matter, I think the article had better be read again, or else he had better take it and read it.

Mr. STONE. Oh, no.

Mr. PENROSE. The Senator is entirely mistaken.

Mr. STONE. I thought he made an argument against something which he said he was in favor of.

Mr. PENROSE. No; I have stated that the manufacturers as well as the growers of Pennsylvania have viewed with great alarm the passage of this measure, and there is some justification for it if we consider the difference in the wages between the employees in the wool industries in the United Kingdom and in the United States.

I shall ask to have these figures inserted. I do not suppose they will be disputed, because they are from the report of the Tariff Board on Schedule K, Table 47, page 926. I will, however, merely call to the attention of the Senate some four or five most remarkable differences in wage rates. In the occupation of wool sorters I find here the excess in the United States over Great Britain in wages is 71.5 per cent; for wool washers, scourers, and driers the excess is 66.5 per cent; card strippers and tenders, 43.3 per cent; comb tenders, 84.3 per cent in excess in favor of the wage earner in the United States. For drawing-frame tender in the case of women it is 131.7 per cent. In the case of worsted-frame spinners for females it is 184.4 per cent; in the case of female winders it is 107.9 per cent. In the case of a female woolen weaver it is 175.2 per

cent, and so on along the line. I insert the entire table at this point.

The table referred to is as follows:

Comparative wages in American and English woolen mills.

[From the report of the Tariff Board on Schedule K, Table 47, p. 826.]

Occupation.	Sex.	Average full-time earnings of 55.6 hours.		Excess United States over Great Britain.
		United States, average weekly earnings.	United Kingdom, average weekly earnings.	
Wool sorter.....	Male.....	\$12.38	\$7.22	Per cent. 71.5
Do.....	do.....	13.42	7.71	74.1
Do.....	Female.....	9.71		
Do.....	do.....	11.19		
Wool washers, scourers, driers.....	Male.....	8.21	4.93	66.5
Do.....	do.....		6.04	
Card strippers and tenders.....	do.....	7.81	5.45	43.3
Comb tenders.....	do.....	7.85	4.26	84.3
Do.....	Female.....	6.52	3.00	117.3
Back wash and gill-box minders.....	Male.....	6.73		
Do.....	Female.....	5.84	2.83	106.4
Drawing-frame tender.....	Male.....	6.80		
Do.....	do.....	8.39		
Do.....	Female.....	6.21	2.68	131.7
Do.....	do.....	6.79	3.41	99.1
Wool spinners (mule).....	Male.....	10.40	5.98	73.9
Do.....	do.....	11.75	7.93	48.2
Warp dressers.....	do.....	12.94	6.33	98.2
Do.....	do.....	14.12	7.91	78.5
Worsted-frame spinners.....	do.....	7.40		
Do.....	Female.....	6.40	2.25	184.4
Do.....	do.....	6.46		
Reelers.....	do.....	5.46	2.94	86.7
Do.....	do.....	6.93	3.56	94.7
Winders.....	Male.....	7.13		
Do.....	do.....	7.75		
Do.....	Female.....	5.53	2.66	107.9
Do.....	do.....	7.08	3.35	111.3
Woolen weavers.....	Male.....	10.63	6.21	71.2
Do.....	Female.....	10.54	3.83	175.2
Worsted weavers.....	Male.....	12.36	6.12	102.0
Do.....	Female.....	9.55	3.59	166.0
Burlers.....	do.....	5.15	3.20	92.2
Do.....	do.....	7.12	3.51	102.8
Menders.....	do.....	7.77	3.63	114.0
Do.....	do.....	9.19	4.30	112.2
General laborers.....	Male.....	8.21	4.74	73.2

This was published prior to the advance in American mills of from 5 to 20 per cent in 1912.

Mr. PENROSE. How the gentlemen on the other side expect American wages to be maintained with that difference between the United Kingdom and Germany and the manufacturing establishments along the Atlantic seaboard it is impossible for me to imagine.

I have here, Mr. President, something new in the advertising line and in an American journal. One page has reference to bankruptcy sales, and another column is headed "General business troubles." But that may be only a coincidence. On the page to which I desire to refer we have an advertisement which is new for the first time in many years in any journal in the United States. I quote from the Daily Trade Record of Thursday, June 26, 1913:

We have been appointed exclusive selling agents for the United States of America by the following prominent foreign manufacturers:

Sir Titus Salt, Bart., Sons & Co. (Ltd.), Saltaire, England. Men's wear fabrics. Manufacturers of fine fancy worsteds and Belwarp serges, guaranteed to maintain their color against sun and sea in any climate.

I will ask the Secretary to read the advertisement. It is a most astonishing advertisement, and one that did not appear until after the 4th day of March, when this destructive measure seemed to be certain to be imposed upon the American people.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

[From the Daily Trade Record, Thursday, June 26, 1913.]

We have been appointed exclusive selling agents for the United States of America by the following prominent foreign manufacturers:

Sir Titus Salt, Bart., Sons & Co. (Ltd.), Saltaire, England; men's wear fabrics. Manufacturers of fine fancy worsteds and Belwarp serges, guaranteed to maintain their color against sun and sea in any climate. J. Benn, Jr., Bradford, England; manufacturer of medium-priced serges, staple fabrics, mohairs, and dress goods. Fisher, Firth & Co., Colne Valley, England; manufacturers of the celebrated Colne Valley cassimeres. G. & G. Kynoch, Keith, Scotland; manufacturers of all-wool fancy Scotch tweeds. James Johnston & Co., Elgin, Scotland; manufacturers of exclusive novelties in Scotch tweeds. Robinson & Bairstow, Baildon, England; manufacturers of popular-priced serges and gabardines. Globe Manufacturing Co., Bradford, England; manufacturers of fancy piece-dye worsteds. Samuel Turner & Sons (Ltd.), Rochdale, England; manufacturers of white flannels and men's wear cassimeres.

G. H. Hirst & Co., Batley, England; manufacturers of beavers, kerseys, and cloakings. Moss Bros. (Ltd.), Hebden Bridge, England; weavers, dyers, and finishers of corduroys. Von Hagen & Cole, Verviers, Belgium; manufacturers of medium and low-grade fancy worsteds. Gebroeder Junkers, Rheidt, Germany; manufacturers of low-grade fancy worsteds. F. Brandts, Gladbach, Germany; manufacturer of low-grade fancy suitings. Aaron & Jacob Löw, Beer's Sons, Brunn, Austria; manufacturers of low and medium grade cassimeres and tweeds.

Fabrics and patterns suitable for the American market have been in preparation for several months under the personal supervision of Mr. William J. Hill. Collections will be shown as soon as tariff action permits the quotation of definite prices. Special arrangements have been made for the prompt delivery of sample requirements.

SERGES.

Stocks of leading numbers of serges are now in transit and will be carried in bond, from which sample requirements will be delivered, regardless of existing tariff rates.

W. H. DUVAL & Co.

WM. J. HILL,

Manager Foreign Department, 79 Fifth Avenue, New York.

Mr. STONE. Is the Senator through?

Mr. PENROSE. I am not by any means through.

Mr. STONE. Oh.

Mr. PENROSE. I regret that the Senator is impatient.

Mr. STONE. I saw that the Senator had taken his seat.

Mr. PENROSE. I am just getting warmed up. I regret to see the irritation which this newspaper announcement has caused in the demeanor of the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. STONE. I had supposed—

Mr. PENROSE. It evidently sounded an alarm.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator does not really think that anybody ever listens to the reading of a newspaper article.

Mr. PENROSE. It is an advertisement.

Mr. STONE. I suppose it to be a very able argument so far as made by the Senator.

Mr. PENROSE. I always try to listen to the arguments of the Senator from Missouri with great attention when they are not a filibuster.

Mr. STONE. I have listened to you.

Mr. PENROSE. I hope the Senator will return the same reciprocity.

Mr. STONE. I thought the Senator intended that advertisement to be his peroration—

Mr. PENROSE. No; I am really just beginning, Mr. President.

Mr. STONE. And that everybody on the other side of the Chamber would be satisfied with the effort, and we could go on with the bill. Still I am always so delighted to hear the Senator that I apologize for interrupting.

Mr. PENROSE. I can understand, Mr. President, that the Senator from Missouri should exhibit disturbance when he has read to him as he had just had an advertisement, dated recently, from a selling agency representing itself to be the agent of foreign manufacturing concerns in England, in France, in Germany, and in Belgium, inviting persons to prepare to purchase their products as soon as the pending Democratic bill shall become a law, and in the meanwhile to crowd all they can into the bonded warehouses of this country. Much as the Senator may be determined to press to final passage this bill, it is possible that he has a passing compunction in his mind as he deliberately hands over the American market to the foreign manufacturer and to the cheap labor of Europe, and contemplates the spectacle of the paralysis of every industry in the East and the condition which will confront the grower of wool in the West.

Mr. President, the tariff discussions which have been going on in the United States for the whole history of the Government have certainly for half of that period largely centered around the wool industry and the duty on wool. I have here a volume which contains, among other notable documents, the report of Alexander Hamilton, who was then Secretary of State, made "in obedience to the order of the House of Representatives of the 15th day of January, 1790, * * * to the subject of manufactures, and particularly to the means of promoting such as will tend to render the United States independent of foreign nations for military and other essential supplies."

This, Mr. President, is one of the most remarkable documents, as it is the first, in the history of the tariff discussion in the United States; it is a classic which can not be improved upon from the protectionist point of view. Mr. Hamilton was asked by the House of Representatives to make a report on the subject of manufactures, and particularly on the means of promoting such manufactures as would render the United States independent of foreign nations for military and other essential supplies, and his fertile mind, approaching a virgin field of discussion, produced a document which can not be improved and which hardly can be extended by any protectionist writer in the discussions current in political controversies to-day.

It applies with just as much force, Mr. President, as it did at the beginning of our national history, when the House of Representatives passed the resolution in 1790; and the Republican Party has been just as consistently found in advocacy of the doctrines here laid down as it is possible for any party to be regarding a great national fiscal policy.

This volume, Mr. President, also contains, among other tariff papers, the report of Mr. Robert J. Walker, as Secretary of the Treasury, upon one of the earliest and, in my opinion, the only consistent tariff bill which was ever proposed by the Democratic Party. Mr. Walker did advocate duties for revenue only on an ad valorem basis, the amount of the ad valorem to be fixed by the requirements of the Government. We do not find in his measure sectional protection hidden under general provisions of reduced duties and free trade; we do not find in his advocacy and argument discussion as to the amount of imports which shall be permitted or what proportion of an article the American consumer can use of foreign make and what of domestic make; we do not find any deceptive, alluring suggestions thrown out to the voter before the campaign that no legitimate industry will be disturbed, but we have the flat-footed, logical, theoretical doctrine that the Government should be run on ad valorem duties for revenue only proportioned to the expenses of the Government.

While the Democratic Party has, therefore, wavered and backed and filled in the low-duty, free-trade propaganda the Republican Party can stand consistently on the doctrine laid down by Hamilton in the statesmanlike document to which I have referred.

Mr. President, I only refer to it because Hamilton seems to have considered among military necessities the encouragement of the wool industry. It was a little too early for him in 1790 to know that Bonaparte had to clothe the French Army with English wool, when he was endeavoring to put an embargo on English trade and keep all of England's merchandise out of continental Europe. That was one of the results of France not having what was a military necessity—wool—to clothe her troops and to clothe her people. However, Hamilton makes this remarkable statement about the wool industry in those days:

Besides manufactories of these articles, which are carried on as regular trades and have attained a considerable degree of maturity, there is a vast scene of household manufacturing which contributes more largely to the supply of the community than could be imagined without having made it an object of particular inquiry. This observation is the pleasing result of the investigation to which the subject of this report has led, and is applicable as well to the Southern as to the Middle and Northern States. Great quantities of coarse cloths, coatings, serges, and flannels, linsey-woolseys, hosiery of wool, cotton and thread, coarse fustians, jeans and muslins, checked and striped cotton and linen goods, bedticks, coverlets and counterpanes, tow linens, coarse shirtings, sheetings, toweling and table linen, and various mixtures of wool and cotton and of cotton and flax are made in the household way, and in many instances to an extent not only sufficient for the supply of the families in which they are made but for sale, and even in some cases for exportation. It is computed in a number of districts that two-thirds, three-fourths, and even four-fifths of all the clothing of the inhabitants are made by themselves. The importance of so great a progress as appears to have been made in family manufactures within a few years, both in a moral and political view, renders the fact highly interesting.

It is, Mr. President, from these humble beginnings that the wool industry in the United States has reached its present magnitude—dimensions which are sufficient, so far at least as the manufacturing part of the industry is concerned, and it may be of the woolgrowing also, to supply all the wants of the American people at a reasonable price.

Early the States, in the days when we had tariffs against each other, recognized the importance of encouraging this particular industry. They had their tariffs, their bounties, and their laws to encourage in the different Colonies the industry of wool manufactures. Why we should now, at this late day in our national history, deliberately throw away a proper and consistent source of revenue and have to seek it in other and more direct and inconvenient ways, and at the same time expose to curtailment and perhaps very largely to destruction a great industry essential to our national independence is to me incomprehensible as the doctrine of any sane political party.

Mr. President, I offered a few days ago an amendment to Schedule K of the pending bill. It is the same measure substantially that was offered by me in the last Congress to the then pending wool bill. Those who were in the Senate at that time may recall that most of the majority voted for the measure; that it was carried and put in the then pending bill. Later on in the proceedings the then minority joined with some of the Republicans and put in another amendment, but the amendment did at the time receive substantial recognition and has been introduced by me in order to complete the tariff record of this session.

I will say candidly, Mr. President, that it has not been my intention to offer any amendment, with perhaps a few exceptions, to the pending bill. I take it, although I am not authorized to speak for any Republican Senator but myself, that such is the general sentiment on this side of the Chamber. I fully realize that no amendment offered by me or by my party associates has any chance of passage at this session of Congress. I also feel that it will be at least four years, if there is any revulsion of public sentiment upon these economic questions, before the Republican Party will be in a position to take up tariff legislation. Four years is a considerable period in industrial development. Business conditions are likely to be greatly changed, and should another party be in power four years from now the business conditions will have to be met afresh. I do not think that the historian or the American people will devote very much time to an investigation of what the minority may have done at this session of Congress in a futile way regarding amendments or speeches upon this particular pending bill. Should the people of the United States again sustain the party of protection, the conditions that will then present themselves will have to be met and dealt with. At the same time, in connection with this particular schedule, there is some reason for the introduction of the amendment.

In the first place the Tariff Board has reported on this schedule and made what is admitted to be an exhaustive, careful, and thorough report. In the second place there have been other amendments introduced or will be introduced as substitutes for Schedule K. In view of these facts, in view of the fact that I did introduce the amendment in the last Congress, and in view of the further fact that it represents, so far as I can ascertain, very largely the thought upon the subject of protection, more particularly as regards the manufacturer, I have deemed it desirable to introduce the amendment to complete the tariff record, so far as this subject is concerned, at this session of Congress.

Mr. President, this bill revising the woolen Schedule K, which I have introduced, is offered from the standpoint of those who believe in the protective-tariff policy, which during the greater part of our national existence has been the policy of the United States.

The bill of the majority now before the Senate is so arranged in the woolen schedule as to give the preference—and a very marked preference—to European manufacturers. The substitute schedule which I have presented gives a distinct advantage to American manufacturers in competition for American business.

I believe this to be in accord with the desire of a very great majority of the American people, and, like all sincere protectionists from Washington and Hamilton to the present time, I believe that the protective policy is of benefit to all of the American people of all States and sections. One result of the protective policy, which even its opponents have acknowledged to be a good result, is the diversification of national industries and particularly the spread of manufactures. An economic policy which builds mills and factories in the towns and multiplies the opportunities for employment of the dwellers there multiplies also the market for the products of the farms. Every new manufacturing industry which, under the protective system, gains a foothold in our great industrial States adds to the value of every farm in the Mississippi Valley and elsewhere. That the protective policy is the best policy for the entire Nation always has been, is, and always will be the profound conviction of all sincere protectionists.

PROVISIONS OF THE BILL.

In the proposed revision of Schedule K, which I introduced last year and have introduced in substantially the same form this year, a specific duty of 18 cents a pound on the clean content of wool is the method adopted to protect and encourage American woolgrowing. This method has been employed because it seemed to meet with the approval of the woolgrowers. A specific form of duty is, of course, to be preferred to an ad valorem form wherever practicable.

The specific form of the proposed duty on wool commended itself strongly to my judgment. But there must be grave doubts of the practicability of basing the duty on the clean content from the point of view of administration or as protection to the woolgrowers. This practical difficulty is sufficient to offset, or more than offset, the theoretical advantages of the clean-content method, although the Tariff Board gives it in passing a qualified support (p. 12). The whole subject of the proper form, as well as of the proper amount, of the duty on wool may advantageously be left open until the opportunity comes for another revision of the tariff from the protectionist standpoint.

SPECIFIC DUTIES ON TOPS AND YARNS.

One important merit of this proposed substitute for the woolen schedule of the Democratic tariff bill is the specific form of the duties on tops and yarns. The Tariff Board, in its report, declares that specific duties both on yarns and on tops are wise and practicable, saying (p. 17):

If a specific duty be placed on the scoured content of the raw wool, it would then be possible to levy a specific duty on tops and yarns. The system of specific duties, as is well known, has many advantages for administrative and revenue purposes. It has a further advantage from the point of view of adjusting duties to difference in cost of production at home and abroad. The duty could then be maintained at a constant and definite figure corresponding to a definite and constant difference in cost of manufacture. Under an ad valorem system the amount of duty varies with every fluctuation in the market value of the raw material, while the difference in cost of manufacture remains relatively constant.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to interrupt him there?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. PENROSE. I do.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator has alluded to tops, the rate of duty on which is a very vital issue to the woolgrower, because of the manner in which they are treated in the pending bill. Tops sometimes are as low in price in the market as 30 cents, and again they may be as high as a dollar a pound, the labor being the same to the manufacturer of tops in either case. With the proposed duty of only 5 per cent on tops, the price of wool will not only be reduced to the woolgrower in this country to the world's level of wool, but he will have to reduce his price for wool as much lower than the foreign wool, as is the real difference in the cost of making the tops in this country and abroad, and at that, from the woolgrower's standpoint, the duty contained in the bill on tops is insufficient. I want to ask the Senator if he thinks there would be any benefit to the manufacturers in having that rate so low?

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, I have always thought that the interests of the grower and the manufacturer were identical. As patriotic Americans they are interested in the prosperity of the industry in all its forms and phases.

EXPERT APPROVAL OF SPECIFIC DUTIES.

This official view of the practicability and wisdom of a specific form of duties as applied to tops and yarns is confirmed in the memorial presented by Mr. John P. Wood, of Philadelphia, president of the National Association of Wool Manufacturers, before the Committee on Ways and Means, January 27, 1913. In that memorial a special committee of manufacturers states in a report on the subject of tops and yarns (p. 35):

An examination into the costs of wool combing abroad reveals the fact that in Bradford the commission fee for combing merino tops is 4½ cents, and we believe that a safe estimate of 2 cents per pound would embrace the expenses of the merchant, making a total cost of conversion from raw wool into finished tops of 6½ cents per pound. In our country abundant testimony is at hand to show that in the woolen trade conversion costs are 100 per cent more than those of Europe, so that to equalize by duties the increased cost of combing raw wool into tops, considering solely the merchants' and wool-combers' expenses and eliminating enhancements which may be incident to a duty on raw wool, a rate of 7 cents per pound would be required to accomplish this object.

This committee of manufacturers, out of its practical knowledge, describes the conversion cost of tops as "with but slight variations from year to year, in this country as well as abroad, a fixed amount." As to the conversion cost of yarns and the requisite protective duty, the committee of manufacturers further says (pp. 36-37):

In England and upon the Continent the business is largely subdivided between the merchant who owns the combed wool or tops and the commission spinner who spins the worsted yarns for a fixed fee per quantity. The merchant, as in the case of tops, has to bear the interest on the materials, the warehousing and transportation demands, and the clerical and office outlays incidental to this business. The spinner in turn takes care of the wages expended about his plant, with necessary supplies for its operation, light and power, insurance, interest, and the general overhead charges incident to this kind of mechanical operations.

The costs of commission spinning for various sizes and counts of worsted yarns are thoroughly established in Bradford, and we would quote on standard sizes in twofold yarns to-day:

Quality.	Cents per pound.
24s.....	8
32s.....	10
36s.....	11
40s.....	12
50s.....	16
60s.....	24

These commission prices carry with them a profit to the spinner, which profit, it might be fairly said, would be an amount sufficient to embrace the merchant's charges before referred to, so that the net cost of converting combed wool or tops into finished worsted yarns of standard sizes would be reckoned upon the commission charge for various counts based on the conditions thus named.

Taking the manufacturing costs in this country as double those of Europe, a duty of these amounts on these specific numbers or such sub-

division of the same as to count or size would be necessary to safeguard the American market against the product of foreign machinery.

In the spinning of yarns we have eliminated a factor which we previously referred to as having a marked influence upon costs in the combing of wools, and that is the question of quality and length of fiber. In the converting of tops into the sizes of worsted yarns to which they can economically be spun, the conversion cost varies but little between a fine and a coarse quality of stock; therefore the difference between conversion costs abroad and here can be closely approximated in a constant figure from year to year.

AN INCONSISTENCY.

The bill proposing to revise Schedule K, which has been offered by the distinguished Senator from Utah, and is described by him as based on the report of the Tariff Board—I make any criticism with the greatest respect for the Senator's knowledge of the subject, which is superior to mine—falls, in my opinion, to conform with the recommendations of that board in the character of its duties upon tops and yarns. The Senator from Utah, with great intelligence, safeguards the interests of his woolgrowing constituents by his specific duty of 15 and 13 cents a pound on the clean content of raw wool. This specific duty is in accord with the Tariff Board report; but in proposing his duties on those important manufactured products, tops and yarns, the Senator from Utah departs from the sound principle which he has applied to the case of raw wool, and provides that the protective duty on tops shall be 10 per cent ad valorem and the protective duty on yarns 30 per cent ad valorem in addition to the specific compensatory duties. The use of ad valorem rates to protect the manufacturers of tops and yarns, while the woolgrowers are protected by a specific duty, is a very grave and wholly unnecessary inconsistency in a measure professedly constructed from the protective standpoint. Not only does the Tariff Board distinctly state that (p. 17) "if a specific duty be placed on the scoured content of the raw wool, it would be possible to levy a specific duty on tops and yarns"—not only does the Tariff Board declare this to be entirely practicable, but it holds the specific duty to be fair and effective and preferable in every way, in the words which have just been quoted. Indeed, one of the most salient features of the entire Tariff Board report is the emphasis which is everywhere laid upon specific duties as more scientific and more just both to the American producers and to the Government.

The Senator from Utah acknowledges and accepts this principle as applied to the woolgrowing industry of the Western States, but he rejects it as applied to the manufacture of tops and yarns, where the Tariff Board declares that a specific rate of duty for protective purposes is wholly feasible. This inconsistency is a serious fault, to my mind, in the bill proposed by the Senator from Utah. In the measure which I am offering, the recommendations of the board in this respect are consistently followed. There is a specific duty of 18 cents a pound on the clean content of the raw wool, a specific duty of 29 cents a pound on tops, and a specific duty on yarns, graduated according to their fineness, all constituting a faithful effort to fulfill the recommendations of the Tariff Board, the results of its long and patient inquiry.

COMPOUND DUTIES.

For the purpose both of revenue for the Government and of adequate protection to American producers specific duties are so strongly preferable that I would have arranged such duties on cloths and dress goods in the bill which I have offered, if the judgment of men with practical knowledge of the industry had not been confirmed in my own consideration of the subject, that such treatment of these finished fabrics was entirely impracticable. In every protectionist tariff revision of recent years the application of specific duties to woolen cloths and dress goods has been sought and studied, but the effort has invariably failed. The situation has been well stated in the report of the Tariff Board, where, after an earnest approval of the specific system, the board adds (p. 710):

But no satisfactory method of classifying woven fabrics in the case of manufactures of wool with a view to the assessment of specific duties has yet been devised. Efforts have been made to classify woolen and worsted fabrics according to weight per yard and picks per inch as the proper basis for adjusting rates to relative differences in cost. This method, however, fails to take into account either the great variations in the quality of yarn going into a fabric of a given class or the great variations in the finishing of cloth after the process of weaving is completed. From an examination of many fabrics it appears that no system of classification along such lines has yet been worked out which would act in a fair and equitable manner.

It would seem, then, that in so far as woolen and worsted fabrics are concerned, the only present practicable method of levying duties is to adopt in some measure a system of ad valorem duties. Such ad valorem duties would necessarily be in addition to any compensatory duties levied because of the duty on the raw material. * * * A system of graduated duties, increasing regularly with different increments of value, could be made equitably to equalize the difference in the cost of production on the more expensive fabrics without placing prohibitory rates on fabrics of lower grade.

Unable to secure a satisfactory form of specific duties as applied to cloths and dress goods I have adopted the alternative

suggested by the board and have applied to these fabrics a system of graduated compound duties, partly specific, partly ad valorem, adjusted according to the value of the goods. Not only is this plan approved by the Tariff Board, but it is recommended as the most just and effective method by President John P. Wood, of the National Association of Wool Manufacturers, in his memorial to the Committee on Ways and Means. Mr. Wood there says (p. 22):

The infinite variety of articles embraced in the woolen schedule makes it quite impossible to specify the exactly proper rate for every group, and so to define each group that it would include only such articles as the rates for that group exactly and properly apply to. We have already pointed out that ad valorem rates wholly fail to meet the requirements of the case. The nearest to a general statement that can be made is that the present ad valorem rates, in addition to whatever compensatory allowance is necessary to cover the wool duty, are in most cases the least that would be sufficiently protective to continue the industry in its present proportions and with its present rates of wages; that in the case for which it is not practicable to devise duties wholly in specific form the rates should be compound with at least half of the total sum specific; that for yarns and tops the rates should be specific, and they can readily be levied in that form with more exact justice to all interests than by any other method.

An important feature of compound duties as applied to the lower-priced fabrics is stated by Mr. Wood as follows (p. 23):

In the case of some of the cheaper forms of dress goods and cloths the present ad valorem rates would not be protective, because, as has already been explained, the conversion cost does not decrease in the same ratio as the raw-material cost; hence a percentage of total value that would be adequately protective for goods of medium value when applied to those of low value would not produce amounts proportionate to the difference in manufacturing cost of the cheaper goods. Under the present tariff, as has always been thoroughly understood by those who have given the subject more than superficial attention, the deficiency in the ad valorem rate on low-priced goods is made up in the specific rate, which for such goods is and was always intended to be partly compensatory and partly protective.

REDUCTIONS IN THIS BILL.

Mr. President, as regards the reductions in this bill, it makes very considerable reductions. I invite the attention of the Senate to the extent of the reductions in a few figures which I shall give.

Mr. GALLINGER. Before the Senator does that, can the Senator in just a sentence suggest the relative reductions made by the Senator's bill as compared with those made by the bill of the Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot]?

Mr. PENROSE. No; I can not do that. I think perhaps the Senator from Utah could do that. I have no comparison on that point. I am now referring to the reductions made from the Payne law, the present law:

On cloths, for instance, the duties have been reduced from in the neighborhood of 10 per cent of the rate of duty under the existing law on the high-priced and expensive fabrics, which may be classed as luxuries, to as much as approximately 125 per cent of the rate of duty under the existing law on the lower and cheaper grades. On blankets of the higher grades there are reductions running from 12 per cent to 24 per cent, and on some of the cheaper qualities, where the value runs from 20 cents to 40 cents per pound, the present duties in many cases have been almost cut in half.

The duties on yarns show a reduction of from 8 per cent to 45 per cent of the rate of duty under the existing law under the different conditions of the market. In the same way the duties on tops will show reductions running from 35 per cent to a little over 50 per cent of the rate of duty under the existing law.

In answer to the inquiry of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Gallinger] as to a comparison of rates under the bill introduced by me and that of the distinguished Senator from Utah, I ought to say that they may be rather hard to compare, because I think I have a higher duty on wool than the Senator from Utah has; have I not?

Mr. SMOOT. I think the Senator's duty on wool is somewhat higher. Of course, that carried into the compensatory duties on cloth will make his cloth a little higher.

Mr. PENROSE. We should have to figure from the same rate of duty on the raw product to make an accurate comparison.

These are real and substantial reductions. They constitute a vigorous revision of the schedule. It is my firm belief, however, that the rates proposed are high enough to save woolgrowing and wool manufacturing from serious injury. Of course the rates proposed are higher than those of the woolen schedule in the bill advocated by the majority of the Senate. But the majority bill, it should be borne in mind, is very frankly nonprotective, while the measure which I have presented seeks to give American farmers and ranchmen and American mills at least a fair chance in competition with foreign producers.

THE WOOL-CONTENT PROPOSITION.

Both the bill of the Senator from Utah revising Schedule K and the bill presented on behalf of the minority of the Committee on Ways and Means in the last Congress based the compensatory duty "on the wool contained" in the partly or wholly manufactured product. The motive of this provision of these other measures is undoubtedly well intentioned, but the provision itself in its practical effect is open to very serious

objection. The protective duty on any class of woolen goods should be sufficient to cover the difference in the cost of conversion between our own country and competing foreign countries. This difference is a constant quantity and is practically the same, so far as popular-priced woollens are concerned, for all-wool or part-cotton fabrics.

An ad valorem rate of duty sufficient to cover that difference in conversion cost for all-wool fabrics would be insufficient in the case of part-cotton fabrics of really durable and meritorious quality but of lower value because of the lower cost of the cotton material. In such a case that part of the specific duty that is not actually required to compensate the manufacturer for the duty which he has paid on his raw wool is necessary to make up for the deficiency in the ad valorem duty as an adequate protective duty for the manufacturer. Thus, inadvertently the framers of these other measures offer bills which are not adequately protective, as experience under such legislation would quickly and conclusively demonstrate.

Another grave defect in the wool-content provision of both bills referred to, that the compensatory duty should be allowed only "on the wool contained" in partly or wholly finished manufactures, is that, although the customs officials can distinguish between cotton, a vegetable product, and wool, they can not distinguish between new wool and shoddies, low grades of which are frequently of less value than cotton. This method of basing the compensatory duty on the actual wool content would, in effect, discriminate against honest cotton-warp goods with a pure wool weft of enduring quality in favor of cheap shoddy trash receiving the full compensatory duty. As the Tariff Board says in its report (p. 626):

Goods made with a cotton warp and wool weft may be easily recognized and rated, but it frequently happens that both warp and weft contain more or less of cheaper materials. There are, of course, well-known and simple tests for discovering the cotton content of a fabric, but their application to imported cloths in the customhouse would involve considerable difficulty. Moreover, there is no test known that will disclose the proportion of nolls, shoddy, mungo, etc., to new wool in many varieties of fabrics.

A provision like that referred to in these two other bills would tend inevitably to degrade the character of the clothing of the American people, who, under the present tariff system, have come into the fortunate position of wearing proportionately more new wool and less shoddy than any other people in the world. This is a fact of absolute record, proved by the official investigations of our Government. The United Kingdom, with only one-half as many inhabitants as the United States, has nearly three times as many rag machines for the manufacture of shoddy as this country.

I read this morning, during the colloquy between the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH], an extract from the report of the Tariff Board, on page 72. I will read it again:

The greatest shoddy-producing center in the world is in and near Batley and Dewsbury, England. Of the 900 rag-grinding machines in the United Kingdom, Yorkshire, in which Batley and Dewsbury are located, has 881 machines. In the whole of the United States there are only 346 rag-grinding machines.

SHODDY IN AMERICA AND IN ENGLAND.

British woolen mills, according to an official estimate, use 200,000,000 pounds of shoddy every year. The consumption of shoddy in the woolen mills of the United States in the year 1909—a year of active manufacturing—was less than 80,000,000 pounds. The use of shoddy is decreasing under the protective system of the United States; it is increasing under the tariff-for-revenue system of Great Britain.

I will ask to have the following extract from Men's Wear of June 25, 1913, regarding English fabrics, read by the Secretary.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There being no objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

ENGLISH FABRICS.

An important selling agent, who has just returned from abroad, said recently: "I have been all through certain mill districts in England, and I never before in my life saw such development of the art of manipulation as I have seen in their fabrics. They are past grand masters in making goods which look like what they are not."

"Now," he added, "these goods will not go with the American people. They may for a season, but they will not last. They are not good enough. It is an astonishing thing the amount of shoddy which English manufacturers put into all their cloths. Now, of course, I am talking about the great bulk of business done by England, for everyone knows that, on the other hand, there are English manufacturers who make wonderful fabrics, but the product of these latter mills we will probably see little of in this country."

Mr. PENROSE. British manufacturers import rags for shoddy from all the world. The United States imports almost no rags and shoddy, but exports to British manufacturers every year thousands of bales of rags, for which there is no adequate market and no active use in this country.

Some of the woolen fabrics made by British mills are of excellent quality and workmanship, but a great many fabrics, an immense proportion of the total production, are made from shoddy and other cheap substitutes for wool. These "cheap" fabrics were heavily imported during the life of the Gorman-Wilson law. They are sure to be imported under the proposed rates of the pending bill, which are a great deal lower than the Gorman-Wilson duties—lower, practically, by the difference between 50 and 35 per cent.

This pending measure puts a premium upon the importation of shoddy goods, enormous quantities of which will unquestionably be shipped from Europe as soon as the reduced rates become effective. This will have two very serious results. One will be an impairment of the quality of the clothing of the American people, which is exactly what the country experienced under the Gorman-Wilson law of 1894-1897. Another result will be that American manufacturers, who now use shoddy sparingly or not at all, will be forced to meet their foreign competitors as nearly as possible on even terms and will, therefore, be forced to perfect themselves in the manipulation of these cheap-wool substitutes, an art in which English manufacturers working under the tariff-for-revenue system are confessedly the most experienced and adept in the world.

ONE FLAT RATE AN ERROR.

The pending Democratic tariff bill in its woolen schedule provides for a flat rate of 35 per cent on all cloths and dress goods in "chief value" of wool. Not only is this rate far too low to span the difference in the cost of conversion of these fabrics between the mills of our own country and the mills of competing low-wage foreign countries, but the application of a single flat rate to all kinds and values of woolen goods is a serious fault of technical construction. This defect in the proposed bill has been authoritatively pointed out by a former member of the German tariff commission which framed the last German tariff—Mr. Julius Forstmann, the president of the Forstmann & Hoffmann Co., of Passaic, N. J. For the past 10 years Mr. Forstmann has been a resident of the United States. Before that time he was for 10 years the managing partner in one of the leading German wool manufacturing establishments, founded by his great-grandfather in 1803.

Mr. Forstmann is thoroughly informed as to the art of wool manufacturing and he is also familiar, through his practical experience, with the scientific methods of tariff construction practiced in Germany. Mr. Forstmann, on behalf of the fine American woolen trade which his mill represents, protests against the pending Democratic measure as wrong both in detail and in general purpose. He says:

In the recommendation of a flat rate on partly and wholly manufactured woolen products, a fundamental mistake has been made. The flat rate is wrong from every point of view. It is wrong because of the greater cost of manufacture of fine fabrics, fully explained in my brief to the Ways and Means Committee. It is wrong from a fiscal point of view, because it needlessly sacrifices revenue.

Some of the Democratic leaders have bitterly complained against Republican Congresses that they were willing to receive recommendations from American manufacturers as to the framing of previous tariff laws. Apparently the authors of this pending bill could have profited by consulting with practical American manufacturers more freely and fully than they have done. In other countries able representative business men are not only permitted to express their views as to the framing of tariff laws, but are earnestly invited and urged to give the Government the benefit of their thorough knowledge and experience. That is the practice in vogue in Germany, whose methods of tariff making have so often been applauded as worthy of the emulation of the United States. German tariff commissions are made up jointly of certain representatives of the Imperial Government and certain chosen representatives of the great national industries.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I do not know but that the Senator has already stated this; but Mr. Forstmann, if I remember correctly, has manufactories to-day on both sides of the water.

Mr. PENROSE. On both sides; that is correct.

Mr. WARREN. Both in Germany and in America.

Mr. PENROSE. Yes; I think I stated that.

Mr. WARREN. I did not catch it.

Mr. PENROSE. It was in this capacity, as an expert representing the wool manufacture, that Mr. Forstmann sat on the recent German tariff commission and aided in the framing of the German tariff laws, designed, like the present American law, to give native manufacturers a distinct preference in the home market.

Mr. WARREN. May I interrupt the Senator right there?

Mr. PENROSE. Yes.

Mr. WARREN. Germany formerly pursued about the same course in regard to woolgrowing that this Nation has pursued; but when they made wool absolutely free they had 30,000,000 sheep, and now they have 7,000,000.

Mr. PENROSE. Our number of sheep will go down in the same, if not greater, proportion within a year after the passage of this bill.

THE TARIFF BOARD AND ITS WORK.

A swift cooling of Democratic enthusiasm for a tariff commission or a tariff board became manifest in the year 1911, when the report of the Tariff Board on the wool and woolen industry was published. The board had devoted a year or more to the study of this industry, and its report, therefore, was fuller and more comprehensive than was the case with the other industries examined. A great many exceedingly important facts were officially established by the board—facts thoroughly well known to those engaged in the woolen manufacture but unfamiliar to many of the public men of the country and to the people as a whole.

In this report of the Tariff Board practically all of the main protectionist contentions in regard to the wool and woolen industry were formally substantiated. For one thing, the woolen manufacture was proved to be a highly competitive industry in which no trust or combination existed or ever had existed (pp. 14, 15). This gave the official quietus to a favorite piece of campaign fiction.

The Tariff Board found that the woolen mills of the United States were numerous and large enough to produce all of the woolen goods required by the American people. Even in the worsted branch of the wool manufacture, the development of which started late and was long retarded by unfavorable Treasury rulings, the industry had been brought fully up to date. On this point the Tariff Board report said (p. 15):

It is true that some years ago a greatly increased demand for worsted fabrics, assisted by the high tariff on worsted goods and their by-products, made the manufacture of such goods very profitable and the investment alluring, but this led to a rapid increase of worsted machinery in this country and the building of great modern mills in rapid succession in various parts of the East. A very considerable part of this increase was due to the influx of foreign capital and the transfer of experienced cloth manufacturers from other countries. The result has been a great increase in competition.

Besides nailing the delusion of a Woolen Trust the Tariff Board report destroyed the partisan assertion that enormous rates of duty, ranging from 150 to 250 per cent, in Schedule K were availed of by grasping American manufacturers. The Tariff Board made a special investigation of this branch of the subject, and as a result declared that the prices of woolen fabrics that enter into popular use (p. 14) "are not increased by the full amount of the duty." The board made a collection of representative samples of English woolen fabrics, matched them with American-made cloths with which they were fairly comparable, and then ascertained the mill prices of these fabrics in America and England for the same date.

Exposing the assertion about the enormous duties, the board discovered that while the nominal rates of duty on English fabrics entirely excluded by the tariff would reach an ad valorem figure of 150 or even 200 per cent (p. 14), the comparable American fabrics sold in the market at only from 60 to 80 per cent more than similar goods sold for abroad. The board considered particularly 16 samples of foreign goods, none of them imported, and found that though the nominal duties on such fabrics equaled 184 per cent the price for which similar American fabrics were selling exceeded the foreign price by only about 67 per cent. "This," significantly declared the Tariff Board (p. 14), "is the result of domestic competition." In other words, in this much-attacked industry the principle of American competition was fully effective toward a reduction in the price of goods, just as believers in protection had steadily maintained from the time of Washington to the time of McKinley.

WHY OUR GOODS COST MORE.

Moreover, a large part of the 67 per cent excess of the American price over the foreign price of these comparable woolen fabrics was due not to any charges of the American manufacturers but to the higher prices which the manufacturers were required to pay for their raw material because of the protective duties against foreign wools. "The manufacturer," says the Tariff Board (p. 15), "who imports his wool must pay the full amount of the duty, and this means either additional working capital or an additional interest charge to be paid. Wools grown in the United States are increased in value by the duty, but not by the full amount of the duty."

Moreover, the cost of the product of the American woolen manufacturer is enhanced by the higher cost of erecting and equipping American woolen mills—a cost 45 or 50 per cent greater on the average than in England. The wool duty aver-

ages about 45 per cent. The cost of a mill, building and equipment, as has just been said, is 45 or 50 per cent greater. Then in the important item of labor the American manufacturer pays from 100 to 200 per cent more than his foreign competitors. And labor in the American woolen mills, as the Tariff Board has ascertained and stated, is no more efficient or productive than the same kinds of labor in European mills equipped with the same kinds of modern machinery. There is, of course, a limit to the speed to which textile machinery can be run without impairing the quality of the product, and this maximum speed, the board found, had been reached in England as well as here.

Even the unskilled labor of raw immigrants, the Tariff Board demonstrated, received more money in American woolen mills than the most skilled and experienced English, Scotch, and Irish operatives in the woolen mills of the United Kingdom.

I have already had printed in the RECORD a table showing the enormous difference in wages between England and the United States. Skilled operatives in American woolen mills, according to the figures gathered by agents of the Tariff Board, are paid from two to four times as much for doing the same kind of work as are skilled operatives of the same type on the other side of the Atlantic. It is labor, therefore—almost entirely the higher cost of labor—in one form or another that makes the price of woolen fabrics measured by their cost of manufacture higher in this country than it is abroad.

TWICE THE CONVERSION COST.

A particularly careful inquiry into the cost of conversion of yarns and fabrics was made by the Tariff Board in American and English woolen mills, and as a result of this the board in its report declared that—

Although there are wide variations in both countries from mill to mill, the conversion cost for the same quality and count of yarns in the United States is about twice that in England.

So as to woolen cloths and dress goods. The board on this point states that (p. 17)—

The cost of turning yarn into cloth in the United States compared with England is all the way from 60 per cent to 170 per cent higher, according to the character of the fabric. For a great variety of fabrics, the American conversion cost is from 100 to 150 per cent greater than the English cost.

It should of course be understood that the fact that the difference in the cost of manufacturing cloth is 100 per cent or more does not mean 100 per cent of the market value of the cloth. It does mean that the cost of spinning, weaving, and finishing the cloth is 100 per cent greater. The laborers in America get a great deal more money, but it does not follow that the manufacturers receive a great deal higher profit than is customary abroad. On the contrary, textile manufacturers who have had experience both in America and in Europe have often declared that the competition in this industry in this country is far sharper and more persistent than it is in Europe, and that mill dividends here, on the whole, are less than they are abroad.

One interesting part of the inquiry of the Tariff Board dealt with the manufacture of ready-made woolen clothing, an art in which it is acknowledged that America leads all the world. Agents of the board studied carefully the cost of production at every stage of this industry. For example, they worked out all the items in the manufacture of a good suit of all-worsted clothing made to sell at retail at \$23 upward (pp. 18-22). It took 3.6 yards of woolen cloth to make this suit, and for the manufacture of this cloth 9.7 pounds of Ohio wool were required.

All the woolen cloth in this suit was sold by the mill for \$4.78, out of which, as the Tariff Board showed, there was a profit of only 23 cents for the cloth manufacturer. The price paid by the cloth manufacturer to the woolgrower for the 9.7 pounds of wool was \$2.23, out of which, as the Tariff Board showed, the woolgrower's profit was 68 cents.

If the tariff were reduced enough to efface the cloth manufacturer's profit of 23 cents and the woolgrower's profit of 68 cents, there would be a possible saving of 91 cents in the cost of this typical suit of American-made clothing, for which \$23 or upward is paid to the retail clothing merchant by the man who buys and wears the suit.

Free raw wool and the 35 per cent cloth duty, as embodied in the pending Democratic tariff bill, would more than efface all the 23-cent profit of the American cloth manufacturer and the 68-cent profit of the American woolgrower besides. This would, of course, in the long run, extinguish both branches of the industry unless the people who work in the American woolen mills would accept wages approximately equal to those paid in an English woolen mill, and the people who work on American farms and ranches would accept wages equal to those paid in Australia, Argentina, and South Africa. This is what the radi-

cal Democratic tariff program ultimately comes to—it is the man who works who pays the price.

THE LESSON OF EXPERIENCE.

The authors of this Democratic tariff bill are apparently blind and deaf to all the preachings of experience. Less than 20 years ago a tariff measure, differing from the one now proposed only in that it was markedly less extreme and more moderate in its rates of reduction from existing duties, passed the House and Senate in the second year of another Democratic administration. Under that administration, and only in part, and in small part, because of financial disturbances abroad, a terrible disaster came upon all American industries.

One of the wisest and greatest of American statesmen at that time well said that the money cost of the Gorman-Wilson tariff, the derangement which it brought to American business, and the loss which it imposed upon American wage earners were greater than the cost of a serious foreign war. Senator George F. Hoar, of Massachusetts, in the debate upon the Gorman-Wilson law, declared that the—

warfare is upon the savings bank, upon the life insurance, upon the yeoman on the farm, and upon the workman in the mill. The alliance is between the spirit of sectionalism in the South and that spirit of the North which never has known the impulse of a true nationality.

These may seem severe words, but they were fully justified by the actual consequences of that fatal experiment in tariff for revenue only, which wrecked the second administration of President Cleveland and caused a desperate party, groping about for another issue, to commit itself in 1896 to the quickly exploded notion of free silver coinage at 16 to 1.

The staggering results of the Gorman-Wilson tariff law are sharply illustrated in the record of disaster wrought by it under Schedule K, the woolen schedule, for which I have offered a safe and moderate substitute for the extreme measure now again before the Senate. It is sometimes urged, and doubtless in good faith, by the enemies of the protective tariff system that the business disaster of 1894-1897 in this country was largely due to and simultaneous with severe financial depression in Great Britain and on the Continent of Europe. But this theory, with which our opponents seek to comfort themselves for the complete breakdown of their legislation of nearly two decades ago, is utterly demolished by the hard facts of record in the experience of the woolen manufacture under the Gorman-Wilson law, which, indeed, is not unlike the experience of other great American industries.

Great Britain, our principal competitor in the woolen as well as other trades, did not suffer from adversity, from financial or any other causes, throughout the life of the Gorman-Wilson tariff law. On the contrary, that earlier Democratic tariff which, it should be borne in mind, was much higher and more nearly protective than the radical bill now proposed, conferred an immeasurable boon upon the British woolen as well as other forms of foreign manufacture. Under the Gorman-Wilson tariff, and because of the Gorman-Wilson tariff, British woolen mills exulted in the greatest prosperity they had ever known.

WHAT THE GORMAN-WILSON LAW DID.

The Gorman-Wilson law made woolen cloths and dress goods dutiable at 40 per cent if valued at 50 cents a pound and at 50 per cent if valued at more than that figure. The 50 per cent rate was applicable to most of the imports, and it is to be compared with the single 35 per cent rate imposed on cloths and dress goods by the bill of the present majority of the Committee on Finance. Like the bill now proposed, the Gorman-Wilson law was throughout based in general on the ad valorem system of levying duties. This of itself proved a most costly blunder, for the ease with which fraudulent undervaluations were effected reduced the 50 per cent rate in practice so heavily and constantly that an enormous flood of foreign woolen fabrics, in large part of a cheap, shoddy, inferior character, poured into the United States. As an expert observer of the workings of the Gorman-Wilson policy said at the time:

The reason why the existing tariff is working so disastrously to the American wool manufacture may be stated in one sentence: It is due to the substituting of purely ad valorem duties for the compound duties of previous laws. This change in the form of the duties has been unfortunate in its effects upon the domestic industry, demoralizing to the general trade of the country, and disastrous to the revenue of the Government.

The variations in the styles, grades, and costs of woollens are so multifarious and so constant that local appraisers, however honest and alert, can not ascertain the costs with certainty or uniformity. Where the disposition of the appraiser is to grant the importer an illicit advantage the machinery of the law is unable to cope with the evil.

Different standards are applied by different appraisers at different ports to the ascertainment of the market value of identical goods; the amount of duties assessed varies widely in consequence, and the constitutional requirement that all taxation shall be uniform becomes a dead letter.

These conditions have compelled private citizens to organize in self-defense, to employ their own agents to trace undervalued goods into the market, to gather the evidence that they are invoiced below market

value, and force it upon the consideration of appraising officers, and to aid, urge, and demand that Government officials shall enforce the law. The spectacle of private citizens organizing in this manner to protect themselves against the consequences of defective laws defectively administered is without a parallel in any civilized government. (Bulletin National Association of Wool Manufacturers, 1896.)

And yet the leaders of the Democratic Party learned nothing by those three years of bitter experience. They have again brought out an ad valorem tariff bill, which differs from its ill-fated predecessor of 1894 only in that its attacks upon American industries are more savage and extreme, calculated to work greater injury to American trade and to confer greater benefits upon the trade of Europe.

ROBBING AMERICA TO ENRICH EUROPE.

The Gorman-Wilson law, with its radically reduced duties and faulty ad valorem rates, closed at one time or another one-half of the woolen mills in the United States and turned practically one-half of the American woolen-goods market over to European manufacturers. Terrible distress ensued in American manufacturing communities. Thousands of employees of the idle mills were destitute dependents upon public charity. Even though wages were reduced again and again American woolen mills could not compete with the mills of Great Britain or the Continent, where less than a dollar a day was high pay for an able-bodied man in the textile trades and 50 cents for a skilled woman operative.

The National Association of Wool Manufacturers, in summing up the actual experience of the industry under the Gorman-Wilson tariff, said in 1896:

These two years, in which they have had unrestrained and unfettered access to the wools of the world, have been the most disastrous in the history of American wool manufacture, not excepting the collapse that followed the close of the War of 1812 or the panic of 1837 or the panic of 1857. These three occasions have heretofore stood in men's minds for the worst that could happen to this particular industry, in consequence of commercial panic or change in economic law. Neither of them furnishes a standard by which to measure the extent of the present disaster. * * * All of the old standards were broken down. The volume of imports soon became appalling. * * * It was like the breaking loose of the Johnstown Reservoir—it swept everything before it.

That was the condition in the United States. At that same period the British woolen manufacturers and British journals were hailing the Gorman-Wilson law as a great and glorious benefaction and were exultantly pointing to the high prosperity that the new American tariff had brought to the rich mill owners of the United Kingdom, in contrast with the paralysis and suffering brought by the same law to the populous manufacturing communities of the United States. The Bradford (Yorkshire) Observer, in its annual review of the woolen trade for 1895, described the year as "the most extraordinary of the waning century," and attributed British prosperity chiefly to—

The more reasonable tariff adopted by the United States. * * * Not for years had such a thing happened as that a loom should stand idle with a warp in it for want of somebody to attend to it. Hundreds of households have been stranded because their maids of all work have thrown away the cap and print dress to don the weaver's harden skirt once more.

At this same time thousands of looms in America were standing idle, and the skilled men and women who used to tend them were driven to seek the help of charity. An article in the London Times, written by a distinguished British manufacturer, further emphasized the enormous benefit that had been conferred upon the English woolen industry by the authors of the American Gorman-Wilson tariff law. This writer in the Times said:

There is room for doubt whether outside the West Riding of Yorkshire it is at all generally realized that the year 1895 witnessed a revival in the worsted industry of such magnitude as to be a matter not only for local but for national congratulation. After long years of depression, the varying, sometimes doubtless intermittent gloom of which had lately become painfully intense, the great manufacturing district of which Bradford is the center was visited last year by the full sunshine of prosperity. Roughly speaking, the Wilson tariff, which came into effective operation in the last month of 1894, in place of the strangling system of duties associated with the name of McKinley, reduced the customhouse charges upon the principal products of the Bradford district imported into the States from 100 per cent of their value to 50 per cent.

The Times went on to note with manifest gratification that the value of worsted coatings imported from the Bradford mills into the United States had increased "fully 600 per cent." Helmuth Schwartz & Co.'s annual report on wool at the same time declared that—

the dominant factor in the past 12 months has been the recovery and rapid development of the export trade of wool and woollens to the United States, under the stimulating influence of free wool and reduced duties on goods.

Such quotations from British authorities might be multiplied indefinitely to show the keen appreciation of British manufacturers and editors for the unexampled generosity with which the Democratic framers of the Gorman-Wilson law had crippled and destroyed the industries of their own country in order that

expectant British manufacturers might heap up larger dividends and more easily support the honors and dignities with which their sovereign was wont to reward successful business men. Ruin and misery at home, prosperity, wealth, and luxury abroad were the concrete results of the Gorman-Wilson tariff for revenue only.

If such results followed the enactment of the Gorman-Wilson law, the duties of which were in excess of those of the present bill by a considerable percentage, what must we contemplate to be the result under free wool and the still lower duties of the pending bill when it shall become a law?

WORSE THAN THE GORMAN-WILSON LAW.

Now another Democratic tariff bill is in the making, and because of it another "full sunshine of prosperity" is about to dazzle the mill-owning magnates of the British Isles at the expense of thousands of wage earners in America. The pending Democratic tariff measure goes far beyond the Gorman-Wilson law in the lavish subsidies which it bestows upon the manufacturers of Great Britain and the Continent. Here is a comparison of the rates of the pending bill and of the Gorman-Wilson tariff on the principal products covered by the woolen schedule—and the woolen schedule is fairly typical of all:

	Present Democratic tariff bill.	Gorman- Wilson law.
	Per cent.	Per cent.
Tops.....	5	20
Yarns.....	15	30 to 40
Cloths and dress goods.....	35	140 to 50

¹ Most of the imports under the Gorman-Wilson law actually paid the rate of 50 per cent.

Since the Gorman-Wilson era wages in American woolen mills have advanced on the average about 30 or 40 per cent. There has been no corresponding increase in the wages paid to the employees in the woolen mills of Great Britain; indeed, there has scarcely been any appreciable increase in British wages at all. Is it surprising that British manufacturers are urging their public men and newspapers to avoid any congratulatory comment on the pending tariff-revision measure until it has finally passed both Houses of Congress and received the signature of the President? From the British standpoint this bill is almost too good to be believed.

It actually carries many rates of duty much lower and more favorable to British interests than the New York importers representing these foreign manufacturers dared to ask for in their arguments and briefs presented to the Committee on Ways and Means and to the Committee on Finance. This bill of the Democratic majority is distinctively a bill against America and for Europe.

THE WOOL-CONTENT QUESTION.

Mr. President, I have here correspondence conducted between the Secretary of the Treasury and myself when I was chairman of the Finance Committee during the last Congress, regarding the difficulty and impracticability of making the specific duties on manufactures of wool applicable to the wool contained in such manufactures, and as it explains the matter very fully and gives the opinion of the appraisers in Boston, Philadelphia, and New York, I ask to have it inserted in the RECORD for the information of the Senate as part of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, permission is granted.

The matter referred to is as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, July 12, 1912.

HON. BOIES PENROSE,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I have your letter of July 11 in which you request that you be furnished with the reports of the appraisers and of the Bureau of Standards with respect to the practicability of making the specific duty on manufactures of wool applicable to the wool contained in such manufactures for the temporary use of the members of the Finance Committee, if consistent with the rules of the department.

I am very glad to forward these reports in accordance with your request. It is to be noted that some of the replies are limited to the specific question raised as to whether or not the amount of virgin wool can be distinguished from shoddy, mungo, or flocks, and do not cover the main issue as to the ascertainment of the amount of wool as a whole.

Will you please have the reports returned to the department when they shall have served your purpose?

Yours, very truly,

J. F. CURTIS,
Assistant Secretary.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND LABOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, June 15, 1912.

SIR: Replying further to your letter of June 5, I am pleased to state that the Bureau of Standards can make analysis of the proportion of

wool contained in union fabrics. This determination is a comparatively simple laboratory analysis and can be made with a good degree of accuracy. The possibility of making determinations of wool in garments is not so well assured. In the first place, it would involve injury to the garments, unless they were furnished with projecting samples of the fabric which could be removed for the purpose of analysis.

The determination of shoddy, mungo, and waste components can not as yet be made with accuracy. The present methods available are not entirely satisfactory to the Bureau of Standards and would require further investigation before the bureau would be in a position to state definitely that such analysis could be depended upon. It is a matter which the Bureau of Standards has had under consideration for some time and upon which work is now in progress.

Any further assistance which the bureau can render you will be gladly supplied.

Respectfully,

CHARLES EARL,
Acting Secretary.

The honorable the SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
UNITED STATES CUSTOMS SERVICE,
OFFICE OF THE APPRAISER OF MERCHANDISE,
Port of New York, N. Y., June 6, 1912.

HON. JAMES F. CURTIS,
Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, Washington, D. C.

SIR: In reply to your letter dated June 5, regarding the contemplated tariff provision on wool and woolsens, it would be impracticable, indeed impossible, to ascertain the amount of virgin wool contained in cloth or clothing. The shoddy, mungo, and waste components are intermixed with the wool in the yarn in such a fashion as to make it practically impossible to separate the same and determine the quality of virgin wool in the cloth.

I also call your attention to the fact that it would be impossible to determine the quality of the virgin wool which has gone to make up the cloth. Very different qualities of wool are used in making yarns for cloths, which vary very considerably in value. These could not be distinguished one from another with any reasonable accuracy.

Respectfully,

FRANCIS W. BIRD, Appraiser.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
UNITED STATES CUSTOMS SERVICE,
OFFICE OF APPRAISER OF MERCHANDISE,
Port of Boston, Mass., June 10, 1912.

The honorable the SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: Replying to department letter 86689, dated the 5th instant, requesting information, in connection with the contemplated revision of the tariff on wool and woolsens, as to the possibility of making the specific duty on manufactures of wool applicable only to the virgin wool contained therein, I beg to report as follows:

For purposes of this report manufactures of wool may be separated into three main divisions, viz, worsteds, woolsens, and felts.

Worsteds are easily analyzed, for the reason that the yarns of which they are composed are made from long-staple wool, which has been combed, thereby removing all the short fibers; and if both warp and filling are of such yarns the weight of the fabric, less the size and dye contained therein, is the net weight of the virgin wool. If the warps are of vegetable fibers, or in part of silk, introduced to form figures or stripes, the same are easily removed by chemical processes.

Woolen cloths are much more difficult to analyze, on account of the varying length of the fibers, processes of manufacture, and mixture with mungo, shoddy, or flocks. Many of the higher grades of woolen fabrics are entirely of virgin wool, but on account of the fulling process used during their manufacture the fibers are matted to a certain extent, and the disintegration of the material by mechanical processes would so destroy the condition of the original fibers that much of the resultant product would seem to be shoddy.

Shoddy is the best of the so-called artificial wools, being the wool fiber recovered from worn but all-wool, long-staple materials, and which has never been fulled, or, if so, only slightly. The length of the fiber varies from one-half inch to 1 1/4 inches, according to the original length of the staple in the fabric from which the shoddy is made. Dyed shoddy can be detected from similarly dyed wools, for the reason that the color of the former will betray the inferior article compared to wool, since the rags or waste previous to the redyeing had been dyed different colors, and which will consequently influence the final shade of color obtained from the redyeing accordingly.

Mungo is produced by reducing to fiber pure woolen rags from cloth heavily fulled, and the natural consequence of the strong resistance to disintegration offered by felted fabrics results in that short fibers about one-fourth to three-fourths of an inch in length are obtained.

Flocks is the resultant product of mechanically grinding woolen materials or fibers, and has practically no length.

If, therefore, woolen fabrics have any of the foregoing shoddy—mungo, or flocks mixed with them—the mechanical separation of the material would not show exactly the proper weight of the virgin wool used on account of a great many of the original fibers having been broken up.

Felts, from their manner of production, would be impossible to separate into their component materials, and the determination of the virgin wool contained therein would be the merest guesswork.

From the foregoing it would appear to be extremely difficult, if not impossible, to accurately ascertain the weight of virgin wool in many fabrics, and it would be absolutely impracticable to determine the wool content of garments, wearing apparel, and made-up articles without destroying the same.

Respectfully,

W. T. HODGES, Appraiser.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
UNITED STATES CUSTOMS SERVICE,
OFFICE OF THE APPRAISER OF MERCHANDISE,
Port of Philadelphia, Pa., June 12, 1912.

The honorable the SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: Referring to the communication of the department of June 5, 1912, concerning the feasibility of making the specific duty on manufactures of wool applicable only to the wool contained in such manufactures, I respectfully report that I have submitted the question to all those in the office whose skill and experience entitle them to give an

expert opinion on the question, and find that it is the consensus of opinion that it would not be possible to determine, with any useful degree of accuracy, the amount and particularly the class of virgin wool in cloths and still less in garments or articles of wearing apparel.

In the case of cloths made of worsted yarn, which is only wool with no admixture of shoddy, mungo, or waste, it might be possible, though certainly at a great expenditure of time and labor in each case to make a working approximation of the amount and class of wool, but in the case of cloths made of woolen yarns, which may and generally do contain the baser components, any approximation that could be made, even after painstaking examination and analysis, would be nothing but a mere guess in which probably no two experts would agree.

This being true of cloths in the piece, it of course holds true a fortiori for made-up garments and wearing apparel and other articles. Unless a part of the article could be taken for disintegration and analysis, which in many cases would involve the practical destruction of the sample selected, the amount and character of the contents could be ascertained only by inspection, and all our experts are agreed that the results so obtained would differ so widely that no reliance could be placed on them for any practical or dutiable purpose, and would only open the way to endless disputes and litigation.

Respectfully,

F. P. VINCENT, Appraiser.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, to sum up briefly, I have explained that the bill which I have offered as a substitute for the wool and woolen schedule of the pending Democratic measure is a revision from the standpoint of those who believe in the protective-tariff policy as the best policy for all the people of the United States. The bill is in accord with the desire of the very great majority, for only a minority of the voters at the late election supported the party which declared for a tariff for revenue only, while a great majority sustained the two political parties, Republican and Progressive, whose platforms, although differing in detail, both declared unequivocally for a tariff for both revenue and protection.

The bill places a specific duty of 18 cents a pound on the clean content of raw wool. The specific form of duty is preferred, but doubts are entertained of the practicability of basing the wool duty on the clean content. The whole subject of the form and the amount of the duty on wool might be advantageously left open until a protectionist revision of the tariff is at hand.

I have quoted both from the Tariff Board report on wool and woolens and from statements of the National Association of Wool Manufacturers to prove that specific duties on tops and yarns were practicable—the method which has been adopted in this bill. I have criticized in a friendly spirit the bill of the Senator from Utah for a serious inconsistency in that, while protecting the woolgrowers by a specific duty, the bill provides ad valorem duties for tops and yarns, a discrimination against manufacturers not recommended by the Tariff Board. I have explained that my bill places specific duties on tops and yarns and would have placed specific duties on finished fabrics also if the plan had not proved impracticable. As an alternative the method suggested by the Tariff Board of compound duties partly specific, partly ad valorem, and graduated according to value has been embodied in the bill.

This proposed substitute makes considerable reductions from the existing law. On cloths, for example, the duties are reduced from 10 per cent of the present rate on the high-priced to as much as approximately 125 per cent of the present rate of duty on the lower-priced fabrics. There are reductions on blankets of the higher grades from 12 per cent to 24 per cent, and on the cheaper grades the present duties are almost cut in half. Yarns show a reduction of from 8 per cent to 45 per cent under different market conditions, and tops from 35 to more than 50 per cent. These are real and substantial reductions, but it is believed that the rates proposed will save woolgrowing and wool manufacturing from serious injury.

The cost of conversion in the woolen manufacture is practically a constant quantity in popular-priced all-wool and part-cotton fabrics. An ad valorem duty sufficient for one class of goods would not be sufficient for another. Customs officers can discriminate between wool and cotton in fabrics, but can not distinguish between new wool and shoddy. Therefore the proposals in the certain other bills offered by Republicans as a substitute for Schedule K would, in effect, discriminate against honest cotton-warp fabrics with a pure-wool weft in favor of cheap shoddy fabrics. The Tariff Board report shows that there are nearly three times as many rag-grinding machines in the United Kingdom as there are in the United States. Moreover, 200,000,000 pounds of shoddy are used every year by wool manufacturers in Great Britain as against 80,000,000 pounds in the United States. The admission of foreign fabrics at reduced rates would degrade the woolen clothing of the American people, as happened under the Gorman-Wilson tariff law, and would force American manufacturers, who use shoddy sparingly, to use a great deal of it in order to be on an equality with their foreign competitors.

The Tariff Board report shows that its careful inquiry has formally substantiated practically all the chief protectionist

contentions regarding the woolen industry; that the tariff is not added to the price and paid in full by the consumer; that competition keeps down American prices; that American goods cost more because of the higher cost of labor, mill buildings, and equipment and supplies and materials; and that unskilled immigrants in the woolen mills of the United States are paid wages as high as those earned by the most skilled and experienced English, Scotch, and Irish immigrants in the woolen mills of the United Kingdom.

The Tariff Board report gives an analysis of a typical ready-made suit of wool clothing made to sell at retail at \$23 and upward, the entire cost of the woolen cloth in which was \$4.78 and the entire cost of the raw wool \$2.23, the profit of the wool manufacturer on the wool required to make this suit being 23 cents and the profit of the grower of the wool that entered into it being 68 cents.

The experience of the American wool manufacturer under the Gorman-Wilson Democratic tariff of 1894-1897 has been referred to. Under this tariff one-half of the American market for woolen goods was monopolized by foreign manufacturers, and at one time or another one-half of the American woolen mills were idle and their employees were dependent on public charity. The Bradford (Yorkshire) Observer and the London Times describe this same period as the most prosperous which English woolen manufacturers had ever known. Comparison has been made of the rates on woolen goods in the Gorman-Wilson law with those of the pending Democratic bill, showing that the duty on tops, which in 1894-1897 was 20 per cent, is only 5 per cent in the present bill; that the duty on yarns, which was 30 to 40 per cent, is now only 15 per cent; and that the duty on cloths and dress goods, which was from 40 to 50 per cent, is now only 35 per cent in the proposed measure. Is it surprising that British manufacturers are urging their public men and newspapers to avoid any congratulatory comment on the pending tariff-revision measure until it has finally passed both Houses and received the signature of the President? From the British standpoint this bill is almost too good to be believed. It actually carries many rates of duty much lower and more favorable to British interests than the New York importers representing these foreign manufacturers dared to ask for in their arguments and briefs presented to the Committee on Ways and Means and to the Committee on Finance. This tariff bill of the Democratic majority is distinctively a bill against America and for Europe.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I have listened with interest to the recital of the feelings of our friends in the British Isles to which the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] has alluded quite fully, and I ask to have read at the desk a short article which was printed in the New York Press, relating to the same subject.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

[From the New York Press.]

Let all Americans pray that when the new tariff is in operation there will not happen to us all the things the British are confident will happen to us.

We have been examining, for instance, a commercial call to the British in a flaming poster-pamphlet for the most part printed, appropriately enough, in vivid red ink. On the outside front page there is an inviting picture of the Atlantic coast, with a high stone sea wall, behind which our market hitherto has rested secure from commercial invasion.

But now the picture shows the wall battered down in front of New York Harbor and fleets of ships steaming in a continuous mass from the British Isles across the Atlantic Ocean to the seizure of the richest market in the world—the market of the United States. And, further, to explain that illuminating picture there are under it these words:

"The cut in the tariff wall is bringing British manufacturers on the run."

Here is some more of the British advertisement:

"A cut in the tariff on imported goods of 100,000,000 people who have the largest spending power per capita of any nation in the world is making John Bull get busy."

In the way of encouraging dilatory British manufacturers and merchants to join those already busy with their plans to flood our markets, the advertising circular explains more in detail:

"John Bull has always loved the American markets."

"A hundred millions of people who have the largest spending power per capita of any nation in the world, speaking the same language as his own, governed by similar laws and customs, employing similar trading, transportation, and advertising systems, appeal to him as providing the happiest hunting ground for trade the world has to offer him. He has always assiduously cultivated it, in spite of high protective tariff designed to keep him and others out. Witness a few figures:

Total value of imports from the United Kingdom to the United States during the past five years.

1908	\$190,355,475
1909	208,612,758
1910	271,029,772
1911	261,289,106
1912	272,940,700

"Note the steady increase—excepting the falling away in 1911—an increase of \$82,585,235 in five years."

"This enormous increase has been achieved under the existing tariff. What will be the figures under the new tariff, which reduces the duties on many articles and makes a breach in the tariff wall of which scores of British manufacturers are at this moment preparing to take advantage? Every boat is bringing British merchants over to survey the field and make arrangements for marketing their goods."

"Do you want to share in this coming trade? Do you want to share in this expenditure of British money?"

Thus we see that in the expectation of our British kinsmen this country, with its flourishing industries, is to be, in the way of sport, a happy hunting ground for our always sport-loving cousins across the sea. In the way of a feast after the sport it is to be fish, fowl, and meat—everything from oysters to plum pudding.

Yes; that is the feast the British appear to expect us to be for them. But they ought not to permit their joy of anticipation to be too immoderate. They ought to temper their chop-licking jubilation with the thought that, if we are to be such easy game for them, then before they pick the last bone of the feast we make for them, those of us not yet devoured shall rebuild that wall and put the revelers outside of it, as once before we did when they came in droves to gorge on the home markets of the United States.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, I have been greatly interested in the clipping which the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] has had read to the Senate, and, bearing on the same subject, I should like to ask the Secretary to read quite a remarkable extract from the Evening Call, of Woonsocket, R. I., published on July 29, 1913, being an interview with a gentleman who is not known to me but may be known to the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LIPPITT].

Mr. STONE. Does the Senator desire to have the two columns he holds in his hand read?

Mr. PENROSE. I should like to have them read for the instruction of the Senator from Missouri. I am afraid he would not read the article if it were merely printed in the Record.

Mr. STONE. I will neither read it nor hear it read.

Mr. PENROSE. Then, I will read it myself.

Mr. STONE. It is an absolute waste of time.

Mr. PENROSE. I regret to see that the Senator from Missouri feels that the dissemination of knowledge is a waste of time. The article is as follows:

Louis Le Poutre, of Roubaix, France, the controlling owner of the Lafayette Worsted Co., of Woonsocket, makers of yarn, is here on a brief business trip. The Le Poutre interests, besides owning the Woonsocket plant mentioned, which employs 600 to 800 operatives, employ over 3,000 people in the big mills at Roubaix, and, in addition, have large plants in Germany. When he discussed the present tariff situation, Mr. Le Poutre did not hesitate to say that if the tariff is reduced as at present contemplated by President Wilson and Democratic leaders at Washington, he and other European manufacturers will flood the United States market with goods made much cheaper than similar goods here, owing to the low labor costs in Europe.

I am not surprised that the Senator from Missouri does not care to have facts of this character read in the open Senate. The article continues:

Concerns like those controlled by the Le Poutre interests, and which have plants in America and also in Europe, will, he says, be obliged to shut down their mills in this country, largely increase the outputs of their European factories, and flood the markets here with goods made across the water and landed here cheaper than they can be made here. He says that the United States is being laughed at in Europe because of the present plan to demolish large sections of the tariff wall—

I may say in this connection, Mr. President, that we have become a laughingstock in other matters in a recent period—

and says there is great rejoicing in France, Belgium, Germany, and England among mill operatives as well as manufacturers.

Mr. Le Poutre said that men who manufacture both here and abroad are satisfied that the new duties will greatly hurt the worsted manufacturing in the United States, leaving the woolen and worsted mills in this country only a chance for the production of coarse cloths.

Mr. Le Poutre was asked by a reporter of The Evening Call:

"What will be the effect of the tariff of 20 per cent on woolen yarns and 35 per cent on woolen cloths?"

"The woolen industry has considerably expanded in this country," he replied, "especially during the past 15 years. We can say that, so far as spinning and also weaving of the wool are concerned, the workmanship is as good here as in any other country, and the labor is as capable, excepting perhaps in the finer numbers and fine cloths."

"The average general cost annually and the cost of labor in this country are double those in Europe. This question has been greatly debated and generally admitted."

"If they want to establish a tariff duty by taking as the basis the maintenance of present wages paid here, I contend that 20 per cent duty on yarns is insufficient, excepting for the coarser yarns, for which the labor is not so important. As an example, we can purchase the two-fifties French system, which is a standard number everywhere, at 71 cents in France and Germany. By adding 14 per cent for the 20 per cent duty and 4 cents for transportation and commissions, we find that it will cost 89 cents. The present price in the market here, reduced already because of the fear of the future, is 99 cents—a difference against America of at least 10 cents per pound."

"It can readily be seen that we will not be sufficiently protected with the proposed tariff, and that it is not a duty simply of 20 per cent that is necessary, but a scale of duties that would protect the fine yarns which cost more here to produce. It would be about the same for the fine cloth that necessitates almost proportionately fine workmanship."

"We must not forget that Europe has a woolen industry that is very great and that could be extended to clothe some 10,000,000 more people at hardly no increase in size of plants."

"I believe myself to be well informed and sufficiently independent in the question, even if I am a manufacturer in this country; I am also one on much larger scale in France and Germany; and I have hopes of reimbursing in those countries a part of the losses that I might suffer here because of the new tariff."

"The American manufacturer has not this advantage. We are to make a terrible jump from one extremity to the other. Those who are, like myself, so situated that they manufacture both here and abroad are convinced that the new duties would kill the worsted industry here, leaving only a chance for the production of coarse cloths, with only a fraction of the help employed. That is my opinion, and I submit it with all sincerity."

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, I do not intend to undertake an extended discussion of the subject of wool and the woolen tariff. It is a subject that has been discussed very largely in the past in all of its general phases, and I do not feel that it is necessary to discuss it in detail at this time. The brilliant and exhaustive exposition of the subject which has just been made by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] is an additional reason for not now attempting to cover the whole ground. I do, however, want to consider two particular branches of the subject, which have been considered in the remarks of the Senator from Pennsylvania and previously, I think, in the remarks that have been made here by the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT]. I desire to add my evidence, such as it may be, as a sort of cumulative testimony as to these particular branches of the subject. Another reason for considering them is because there is a disagreement between the dominant party in the two branches of Congress as to the treatment which they should have. I refer particularly to the duties that are proposed for tops and for flannels.

In paragraph 295 combed wool or tops is given a duty, as the bill came from the other House, of 15 per cent, and the duty has been changed, as the bill now appears in the Senate, to 5 per cent, a reduction of two-thirds of the duty. I want to consider the reasons for that and the effect of it, not particularly as it applies to the woolen manufacturer, for I think his interest in the matter, while considerable, is small as compared with the interest which the woolgrower has in it. Therefore the remarks that I am about to make are more particularly intended to show the effect that the proposed reduction will have upon the fortunes of the men growing wool, for, if I understand the situation aright, it is equivalent not merely to putting wool upon the free list, but to offering a bounty of in the neighborhood of 3 cents a pound for the importation of foreign wool as against the use of the domestic article.

I desire to consider, therefore, with reference to this point, the cost of making tops in this country, in the first place, as it is shown in the Tariff Board's report. That particular feature in the Tariff Board report is considered principally on pages 640 to 644. It is also considered in somewhat less detail in other parts of the report. In all the places where it is considered the evidence which the Tariff Board give is so indefinite and so general in its character that while we can obtain much useful information from it, we can not, without some additions to what is set forth there, use it as a complete exposition of the subject.

They give, on page 643, a table which is the nearest to a complete statement of the subject that I can find in any part of the report. It applies to the making of fine tops by what is known as the French system, as distinguished from the English system.

I presume most of the Senators here understand what a top is, although, in spite of all the discussion that has occurred in regard to it, only a few days ago one of the Members of this body asked me what a top really was. I will say, therefore, if there are any others in the same mental condition, that in turning a raw material into yarn there are four processes which are alike in their principle and purpose as applied to all the materials of which yarns are spun. Whether the article to be spun is cotton or flax or silk or wool it is necessary, in the first place, to clean it; in the second place, to lay the fibers parallel; in the third place, to reduce it from the bulk in which it appears in the market to the size that it is desired to appear in the yarn; and, in the fourth place, simply to twist it. That is all there is in the process of making textile yarns for the manufacture of cloth.

In the case of wool the top represents the product of the second of these processes. To make wool and turn it into a top it first has to be cleaned, or scoured, as it is called, sorted to remove the inferior parts of the growth of the animal, and then it is put through sometimes a card and sometimes a comb for the purpose of laying the fibers parallel to each other. Combing is the more perfect method of accomplishing this result, and is naturally more expensive than the less perfect form of doing it, which is represented by carding. The process is very much the same as the process by which one combs his hair. It is simply drawing some teeth through the wool, or drawing the wool by the teeth, to lay the fibers side by side.

The resultant article in the case of wool, for some unknown reason—for the origin of the name, so far as I can find out, is lost in obscurity—is called, technically, in the trade a top.

Coming back to the table upon page 643 of the Tariff Board report, to consider what it costs in this country to make a top by the processes which are considered in the table, we find that the costs in four different cases ran from 7.25 cents a pound to 7.32 cents a pound—not a great difference. But those figures do not represent the costs of all the processes necessary for turning wool into tops, and they do not represent all the conditions to-day.

A year ago, when this report first came out, I spent a very considerable amount of time in trying to satisfy myself as to what the board really reported the cost of a top to be. I found it was necessary to add to this table something for the cost of sorting, something for the interest upon the difference in the cost of a plant in this country and in Europe—because in another part of the report the board shows that that difference is about 60 per cent—something for the cost of storing and handling the raw wool and for the interest and storage charges of holding it and carrying it, something for the actual conditions under which a mill operates, and something for the increase in wages that has occurred since the report was made. The figure of 7½ cents a pound is a theoretical figure based upon the costs that the Tariff Board obtained, but edited to show the cost of a mill running full time. The woolen business is of such a character that it very seldom happens that a mill does run full time, and actual costs can not be taken on that theoretical supposition. The board itself makes a very elaborate exposition of this subject on a previous page, where it shows that the difference in cost that may result between a mill that runs full time and one that runs only a part of that time is, in some cases, as great as the difference between 3.24 cents a pound and 10.85 cents a pound. Those are very extreme cases, however, the lowest cost being in the case of a mill that ran overtime—more than full time—and the highest cost being in the case of a mill that ran very much less than full time.

Making the proper additions to the cost which the board gave, 7½ cents a pound, I came to the conclusion that the Tariff Board report showed that for the kind of top that was there being considered it cost 10.91 cents a pound.

I then took occasion to ask a gentleman in Philadelphia, Mr. Walter Erbin, of the firm of Harding & Erbin, if he would make an examination of this subject, based upon the same Tariff Board table I had used, for the purpose of seeing how his results would compare with mine. In every industry like woolen manufacturing there are certain men who become recognized among their fellow craftsmen as experts in certain directions. The very remarkable mathematical mind of Mr. Erbin has made him recognized throughout the trade as an expert in the statistics of woolen manufacturing. He made a most exhaustive and elaborate calculation from the various statements that were made in the report upon the same subject. He considered the figures in three different ways, and as a result of that he reported to me that under one method of figuring the cost of making a top was 10.47 cents a pound, under another method it was 11.51 cents a pound, and under a third it was 12.3 cents a pound. He further gave me a very exhaustive statement of the cost of doing the same thing in his own mill, which showed that his cost was 11.33 cents a pound.

I also asked some other friends of mine in New England—and this was all done without knowledge on their part of the costs of the other people—if they would make me a report upon the same subject. The firm of Hill & Nichols, well known as dealers in and manufacturers of tops, said they considered it cost 13.12 cents, and the firm of Brown & Adams said it cost 12.97 cents.

The average of all these seven costs, taken in different ways and by different people, shows that the cost of that kind of a top is 11.80 cents a pound.

We now have to consider what we know in regard to the cost of tops abroad, as represented by the Tariff Board report. The figures there are very indefinite, as would be naturally expected, and more so than the figures in regard to the American cost. The best exposition of the foreign cost is in a table given on page 644, where they show that the cost per pound in a mill on the Continent varied from 3.75 cents a pound to 4.45 cents a pound. But they say that in considering these figures it must be remembered that the mill was not running at its full capacity.

In other words, they have presented the cost of an American mill theoretically based upon its point of maximum efficiency; but they have given us the cost of a foreign mill admittedly based upon a point which is one of inefficiency. So it is manifest that that mill, on the same basis that they have used for the American cost, must have been able under similar conditions to make a wool top for a cost even lower than the figures they present. The lowest figures are 3.75 cents a pound. They

do not include the other items, which, in order to arrive at a complete cost, I have been compelled to add to the table of American cost. So, after all, we are not left in a very well-informed condition of mind, so far as the mere figures go.

But the Tariff Board give additional testimony, in a way, because they repeatedly say in different forms that wool combing can be done abroad for substantially one-half what it can be done for in America. On page 642 they say that English combers state:

We can do for a penny a pound what costs the Americans twopence.

And the board go on to say:

Actual figures seem to indicate the truth of this.

Again, at the bottom of page 644, the board say:

Actual records show that tops can under certain circumstances be made abroad at about one-half the American cost.

They also say (p. 641):

It will be seen that the lowest charge in the United States (for commission combing) is about double the lowest charge in England.

The figures of 3.75 cents a pound which I have quoted for the continental cost as compared with 7.25 cents that the board presents as the figures for the corresponding part of the American cost show that that cost is about one-half the American cost.

It seems to me, therefore, that we can assume that the Tariff Board reports the foreign cost to be one-half the American cost, although the board, after saying in various ways that it is one-half, go on then to say as the summing up that they think it is eight-tenths of the American cost.

We therefore have this proposition as I have arrived at it from my consideration of the matter: That it costs in this country 11.8 cents a pound to produce tops; that it costs abroad one-half of that, which is 5.9 cents a pound, or substantially 6 cents; and that the amount of protection that would have to be given to American tops to put them on a parity with foreign tops would be equivalent to 6 cents a pound.

My idea of the proper way to make a duty of that kind is to make the duty 6 cents a pound. But the duty that has been proposed is an ad valorem duty of 5 per cent so far as the Senate is concerned and of 15 per cent so far as the House is concerned.

We therefore, to complete our examination of this subject, have to consider what a duty of 5 per cent and 15 per cent would amount to. There are complete tables published and frequently distributed among the woolen trade which show the selling price of tops abroad for a great many years back. Taking No. 60 quality, which the Senate will understand is the English name for a quality that is suitable for spinning a No. 60 yarn, we find that the lowest price for that in recent years was 33 cents a pound in March, 1901, and 59 cents a pound in October, 1907, although it also sold in the spring of this year at substantially the same price.

Five per cent duty upon the selling price of 33 cents a pound would be 1.65 cents. On the high price of 59 cents a pound it would give a duty of 2.95 cents; and on the average of these two prices it would give a duty of 2.3 cents a pound. In other words, we find that the duty on this average of the selling price abroad of No. 60 tops would be 2.3 cents a pound, and the difference in the cost between the two is 6 cents a pound.

Let me go on. On a 15 per cent duty figured on the same prices the duty on the low price would be 4.95 cents a pound; on the high price, 8.85 cents a pound, which would be full protection and a little more; and the average would be 6.9 cents a pound. In other words, taking that grade of top, we find that the duty at 5 cents a pound is less than half of the protection that would be required to put the two articles on a parity here and abroad, and that a duty of 15 cents a pound, as proposed by the House, would be protective and give a margin of nine-tenths of a cent a pound on the average of the extreme selling prices, but would be 1.05 cents less than protective on the low foreign price.

Considering further the way it would apply to No. 56 quality, which is a little lower quality, we find that the high price is 53 cents, in June, 1906, and the low price is 31 cents, in July, 1901, and that the average of these prices is 42 cents a pound. Five per cent duty on the low price would be 1.55 cents a pound, and on the high price 2.65 cents a pound, and on the average price 2.10 cents a pound, showing that on that quality where the duties required for an equalization of cost purposes would be 6 cents a pound it is in reality only one-third that.

At a 15 per cent duty it would be 7.95 cents at the high price of the top, 4.65 cents at the low price, and 6.3 cents at the average price. In other words, on a 56 quality with the Senate committee duty there would be 4 cents a pound inducement to importation, and at the House duty of 15 per cent the for-

sign and domestic cost would be on a parity with a margin of safety of three-tenths of a cent a pound on the average foreign price.

Assuming that my exposition of the subject is correct and that the costs are substantially as I have stated them, the thing I want to call attention to is that this is not so much a subject of interest to the manufacturer as it is of interest to the woolgrowers.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Rhode Island yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. LIPPITT. With pleasure.

Mr. WALSH. Before the Senator passes to the consideration of that portion of his argument, I should like to inquire of him why it is that these tops can be manufactured cheaper in England than they can be manufactured here.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, that has been so often explained that it scarcely seems necessary to say anything further in regard to it. Of course it is due to the difference in labor cost and the difference in the cost of the plant and to other similar reasons.

Mr. WALSH. Let us take the labor cost. I suppose that constitutes the chief difference. Will the Senator kindly tell us what is the labor cost to manufacture tops in this country?

Mr. LIPPITT. I have given a very careful statement of the methods by which I arrived at my conclusion.

Mr. WALSH. I followed that carefully.

Mr. LIPPITT. And the basis for the conclusion is the figures in the Tariff Board report. I would prefer, if the Senator wants to have that question answered, that he would himself go to the tables, where he can find it in great detail.

Mr. WALSH. I find given there 2.68 cents per pound as the labor cost of producing a pound of tops. If the total labor cost of producing a pound of tops in this country is 2.68 cents, as given by the Tariff Board, it would occur to me, assuming that labor is one-half as expensive in England as it is here, that the difference in the labor cost can not exceed a cent and a half a pound. Am I correct in the conclusion?

Mr. LIPPITT. If the Senator's premises are correct, his conclusion is correct; but his premises are not correct, because in the table which I have been considering the labor costs were in reality about 4.27 cents a pound at the time that table was made up. Since then there has been an increase in the cost of labor in New England, which adds forty-two one-hundredths of a cent a pound to the labor cost of that article.

I do not care to go into a discussion of these labor costs at this time. I do not want to detain the Senate any longer than is necessary. It is a subject that has been so exhaustively discussed from every phase of it that I do not care to undertake it in connection with this part of my address.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I do not wish to enter into the discussion, but I had an expert examine the Tariff Board report and give me the cost of producing tops in Germany and England. He advised me that the common charge in Germany for making high-grade Australian tops is 4.88 cents per pound, and that the cost in a representative German mill on Australian 60s was 3.45 cents per pound, including interest. The commission charges on high-grade tops run from 55 to 65 per cent higher than in Germany. A fair statement of the cost of making tops in the United States is about 80 per cent greater than in Europe. In 1912 the import value of tops was 71.2 cents per pound.

Mr. LIPPITT. It does not cost 71 cents a pound to make tops.

Mr. SIMMONS. I am not talking about the cost; I am talking about the value. In 1912 the import value of tops was 71.2 cents per pound. According to the above—

Mr. LIPPITT. What tops were those? Will the Senator kindly state the kind of tops and at what duty?

Mr. SIMMONS. In 1912, the import price.

Mr. LIPPITT. What kind of tops?

Mr. SIMMONS. He does not state. I assume that he was referring to the same kind that he spoke of in connection with the cost of making tops.

Mr. LIPPITT. Of course that is a very important matter. The instant we come to a discussion of the cost of tops—

Mr. SIMMONS. Will the Senator allow me to finish the statement? According to the above, it costs 3.45 cents to make tops in Europe and 6.21 cents in the United States. The difference is 2.76 cents, or a little less than 4 per cent of the import price per pound.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, I would like to say, in regard to the statement the Senator makes—

Mr. SIMMONS. The bill allows 5 per cent.

Mr. LIPPITT. I would like to say, in regard to that statement, that the Senator starts off by saying that his expert does not include in his statement all the cost of making tops. It is so common to talk of the cost of making tops as representing merely the cost of taking sorted and scoured wool and putting it through a mill and figuring that the cost of getting it from one end to the other of the combing process, as regards labor and supplies, is the total cost of that top. As I have been explaining for half an hour, and longer than I had intended to take in the matter, that does not represent the cost of tops. We must have the complete and the entire cost. I have given the basis of my figures. I will only say that I gave them as careful examination as it was possible for me to do. Although I am not a woolen manufacturer, and never have been, I am so thoroughly accustomed to the methods of making figures of this kind that I think I was fairly well qualified to do it.

I had those figures checked by a number of independent and skillful manufacturers, whose result corresponded fairly with mine. I will admit to the Senator from North Carolina that there are tops that can be made—

Mr. SIMMONS. If the Senator will pardon me—

Mr. LIPPITT. If the Senator will wait until I finish my sentence.

Mr. SIMMONS. Surely.

Mr. LIPPITT. I was going to say to the Senator from North Carolina that there are classes and kinds of tops that can be made for a lower figure than those with which I have been dealing, but he proposes to enact one uniform duty for all classes of tops, whether their cost is low or high. Therefore, in considering its effect upon importations we can not confine our consideration to a class of tops that is of low cost, because the duty is the same upon tops that are of high cost. Importations are not made upon averages of cost. They are not made upon that proportion of the article which is most fully protected by the duty. They are always made upon that proportion of the article which is least protected by the duty.

I will go so far along the line of argument that the Senator from North Carolina is pursuing as to say that I will agree with him that there are some classes of tops that in all probability under a 5 per cent duty it would not be profitable to import so long as any part of our combing machinery in this country is in active operation. I must insist that there are a very large class of tops the domestic cost of which would be so much lower than the cost of importation under this 5 per cent duty that there would inevitably be larger importations.

Mr. WARREN. May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. LIPPITT. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. WARREN. In that case the manufacturer desiring material from abroad would naturally buy tops instead of wool, unless the price of the domestic wool was enough lower than the foreign wool laid down here to make up the difference.

Mr. LIPPITT. I was going on, if I had not been interrupted, to make a statement in regard to that subject.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

Mr. LIPPITT. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. I merely wanted to refer to the figures quoted by the Senator from Montana as to the labor cost per pound of tops in the United States. He quoted from the Tariff Board report, at page 642. The cost was for sorting, scouring, carding, combing, and the miscellaneous outside labor. It is true that the report gives the cost at 0.0268 per pound, but the report calls particular attention to the kind of tops, because it is made from quarter bloods, and a quarter blood is a very low-grade sheep.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, the inference that I was going on to draw from my analysis—

Mr. SIMMONS. Will the Senator pardon me just a moment?

Mr. LIPPITT. I do not want to decline and, of course, I will not decline to yield to the Senator from North Carolina, but what I want to say is that I am well aware that a discussion of the details of the cost of tops and of the various forms of tops themselves might be undertaken here which would last two or three hours.

Mr. STONE. Then, Mr. President, I hope Senators on this side will not indulge in it.

Mr. LIPPITT. I know the disinclination of the Senator from Missouri to take up time.

Mr. SIMMONS. I shall not take more than a minute of the Senator's time.

Mr. LIPPITT. May I complete my statement before I yield to the Senator?

Mr. SIMMONS. Certainly.

Mr. LIPPITT. What I am trying to do is to put on record for his consideration when this bill comes to conference what I personally think about this question of the cost of tops. I think

that it will serve a much more useful purpose if we do not go into an elaborate discussion of the subject, but for the Senator to take my statements and give them some careful thought. Nevertheless, if the Senator would like to pursue the subject further I will yield to him.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator understands that I am not interrupting him in a controversial spirit at all. I simply desired to give some data that has been furnished to me. If it is not correct I would be very glad to have the Senator give us a correct statement with reference to this data.

The Senator assumed a little while ago that I had not selected any particular count for comparison. Upon examining the memorandum I read from I find that it was based upon Australian No. 60. The German cost of that grade of top made of that wool was 3.45 cents, and the American cost, according to the board's report, 6.21 cents; and the price of the top—and I assume the expert was speaking about that top—was 71 cents a pound, making a difference of 2.76 cents against the American producer in the cost. Upon that basis the difference of 71 cents on the import price as stated would be only 4 per cent, while this bill provides 5 per cent. I wish to call the Senator's attention to the fact that in the report for the year 1912 of the unit value of tops the price is fixed at 81 cents a pound, which is about 10 cents more than the price stated in this memorandum. Therefore the difference against the American would not be so great as 4 per cent upon that basis of price.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, in reply to the remarks of the Senator from North Carolina, as I gather from his figures of the foreign cost they are taken from page 644, where there is a table giving the lowest cost of the foreign mill as 3.75 cents and the average of cost as 3.98 cents; and the report states in connection with those costs that that mill was not running full time. The board has gone into a very elaborate analysis of the difference in cost that occurs from a mill running full time or running short time. To rely upon figures to show foreign cost where the statement is distinctly made that it was not the lowest foreign cost is what I have spent three-quarters of an hour in trying to show is not a safe practice.

Now, to go on with my exposition of this subject, in addition to the figures which I have given, showing that tops can be imported at a duty of 5 per cent, I may say that under the Wilson law of 1894 there was a duty of 20 per cent on tops, and there was a material importation under that duty. The fact which I am trying to make prominent in connection with the fact that the importation of tops is possible is that that is a matter of much greater consequence to the grower of wool than it is to the manufacturer of wool, because if in some process between the point of buying wool and the spinning of yarn there is a point where the article can be imported at a preference over importing raw wool, you might just as well offer an equivalent bounty to the manufacturer to buy that foreign wool so far as the woolgrower is concerned.

I think that, so far as the manufacturer is concerned, if he has a mill that is equipped with the preparatory machinery up to the process of combing, or if his is a combing mill, which is a condition that also prevails in this country—some mills simply make combed tops for sale to those who are going to spin them into yarn; some mills have the preparatory machinery to make combed tops themselves and carry on all the processes from the purchase of the wool to the ultimate delivery of the cloth—in either case if they have this preparatory machinery it will, of course, be an injury to the manufacturer to have to stop it; but if the man is a manufacturer of cloth, a weaver of cloth, and he can buy foreign tops for 3 cents a pound less, as I think can be done in some cases under the provision of this 5 per cent ad valorem, he will be 3 cents a pound better off than if he purchased the raw wool itself. That is the phase of the subject which appeals to me as something that will be of great interest to the gentlemen representing the agricultural sections of this country. We have talked about free wool. A 5 per cent duty on tops is not free wool, but is a bounty-paid wool so far as the grower is concerned.

In regard to the importation of tops, I simply want to offer one further suggestion in regard to its possibilities, and that is something which I found in the Daily Trade Record of August 13, 1912, referring to Australia. It says that the bonus granted by the Federal Government on wool tops exported from Australia amounts to 1½ pence per pound, and that they are mostly taken by Japan. One and one-half pence per pound bounty paid by Australia for the purpose of establishing the top-making industry there instead of merely exporting raw wool is equivalent to 3 cents a pound; and that is equivalent to the total duty that this bill proposes to place on a very large quantity of tops. Any tops that are 60 cents per pound in cost at a 5 per cent duty would have simply the same protection that 1½ pence bounty

paid by the Australian Government would offset; and the producer of the wool again is put not merely in the disadvantageous position of being 3 cents a pound to the bad when there is 6 cents per pound difference in the cost of tops between here and abroad, but he will also be in the disadvantageous position of having the 3 cents a pound duty balanced by the payment of a bounty by Australia.

Mr. SIMMONS. That is a bounty. That is not an export tax?

Mr. LIPPITT. It is not an export tax. It is a bounty that applies to all countries. If Australia treats all countries alike, there is nothing in this bill that would enable us to put a retaliatory duty upon it.

Mr. SIMMONS. That was what I wanted to understand.

Mr. LIPPITT. I presumed that that was what the Senator from North Carolina had in mind.

Mr. SIMMONS. I wanted to understand from the Senator whether Australia paid this bounty, as he calls it, for the production of the tops consumed in that country or whether it only pays it on tops exported from that country.

Mr. LIPPITT. I will say to the Senator that, so far as I know, there are no tops in Australia. Australia is not a manufacturing country. She is a producer of raw wool; but evidently the Australians are very anxious to establish an industry of this kind there and, following the American practice, which has been of such benefit to this country, they do what is in effect putting a protective tariff on tops, and, it being an export article, that protection is in the form of a bounty.

Mr. SIMMONS. I understand that Australia is a great producer of raw wool, and that it is not a manufacturing country; but I understood the Senator to say that they did comb it and that they put a bounty on combed Australian wool. Did I misunderstand the Senator?

Mr. LIPPITT. They put a bounty of a penny and a half a pound upon combed Australian wool as an inducement for them to export the wool in a combed condition instead of exporting it raw.

Mr. SIMMONS. That is exactly what I thought. Now, does the Senator lose sight of the fact that under this bill, where there is an export duty or bounty provided by a foreign country we add the amount of that duty or bounty to the tax?

Mr. LIPPITT. I do not lose sight of the fact that if a foreign country imposes an export duty—if that is what the Senator wants to get at—which applies to this country alone, then the retaliatory provision of the pending bill would apply; but if a foreign country has an export tax or bounty applying to all countries alike, the retaliatory provision in this bill would not lie against that country. That is the distinction, as I understand it.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Rhode Island yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. LIPPITT. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. CUMMINS. The Senator from Rhode Island began a statement some time ago, and I think was diverted, so that he did not complete it, at least he did not furnish the comparison which I desired him to institute. He gave the high price of tops of a certain character and the low price of tops during a certain period. Would he give the Senate the high price of scoured wool and the low price of scoured wool for the corresponding dates concerning which he gave us the prices of the tops?

Mr. LIPPITT. I regret to be obliged to say that I have not those statistics here. They are very easily obtained.

Mr. CUMMINS. I assumed that the statistics were before the Senator, and I thought that it would be very interesting to know the difference between the market value of scoured wool of the kind from which the tops were made and the price of tops. That would furnish us, I think, some fair guide as to what it costs in that country to convert scoured wool into tops.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President; I regret that I have not that information at hand. It is, however, information that is very frequently published, and can be found in almost any of the daily or weekly trade papers which particularly give information with regard to the wool industry.

Mr. CUMMINS. I know, Mr. President, that that is true; and I would not have interrupted the Senator had I not assumed that he had before him the tables showing that comparison.

Mr. LIPPITT. Now, Mr. President, to take up the next topic to which I want to call the attention of the Senate, paragraph 298, which provided, as the bill came from the House, for a duty of—

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Rhode Island yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. WALSH. Before the Senator passes from the subject of tops, I should like to ask him a question if it would not be particularly objectionable to him.

Mr. LIPPITT. Certainly; I yield to the Senator.

Mr. WALSH. I ask the question because we all recognize how very familiar the Senator is with the textile industry. The only purchasers of tops, of course, are the spinners of yarn. That is the entire market, is it not?

Mr. LIPPITT. Yes, sir; so far as I know.

Mr. WALSH. The purchasers of tops may be engaged exclusively in the spinning of yarn or they may spin yarn and subsequently weave it into cloth. Can the Senator tell us how many establishments in this country are engaged in the manufacture of tops with a view to the selling of tops to yarn spinners or weavers, and how many customers they have?

Mr. LIPPITT. I will say to the Senator that I can not give him the exact information; but the manufacture of tops as a finished article of the factory has been a branch of the industry that has been continually and rapidly increasing of late years, not merely here, but in all parts of the world where the manufacture of worsted cloth is carried on. There seems to be a growing habit of differentiation—"specializing" perhaps would be the better name for it. I can not give the Senator the exact information in regard to the number of establishments, but there is a considerable market in this country for tops.

Mr. WALSH. I got the impression from some testimony given by Mr. William Whitman before one of the committees of the Senate only a short while ago, that his mills, the Arlington Mills, were the principal producer of tops for the market in this country, the other great producer being the American Woolen Co., and that they practically were the only companies manufacturing tops for the market. If that is the case, I should like to hear from the Senator why—

Mr. LIPPITT. I hope the Senator will not go ahead with the question, because it is founded upon the assumption that that is the case. I will merely say for his information that that is absolutely not the case.

Mr. WALSH. Then let me put the question in a different way and ask the Senator why he should deny to the manufacturers of yarn, the spinners of yarn, in this country an opportunity to buy their tops abroad, rather than to buy them from the manufacturers of tops in this country?

Mr. LIPPITT. I know of no better way to answer that question than by saying that I am in favor of the protective policy. If I were simply in favor of the protective policy as applied to cloth, I naturally would be in favor of so arranging the duties that the cloth manufacturer could have free trade up to the point where he made his cloth and be protected afterwards; but that is not my understanding of any proper application of tariff duties, and, with a very few exceptions, it is not the disposition of the cloth makers of this country themselves. The great bulk of the manufacturers of wool recognize the propriety of the same treatment of wool as is given to the manufactured article.

Now, Mr. President, if I may be allowed to go on with my next topic—

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I am sure the Senator does not want any inaccurate statement of fact to go into the Record, and I think the Senator made a statement a few moments ago that is not accurate.

I was not quite sure about it at the moment; but I have looked the matter up. It is in reference to the bounty or export tax placed by Australia upon tops. While raw wool is free under this bill, tops are dutiable, and the Senator is mistaken, I think—

Mr. LIPPITT. What is the number of the paragraph which the Senator has in mind?

Mr. SIMMONS. Paragraph E, page 254, from which it appears that if any country imposes an export tax or gives a bounty upon exportations from that country into this country, then, under that paragraph, that bounty is added to the tariff or tax imposed on its admission into this country. The provision does not apply, as the Senator seems to think, merely to countries that charge an export tax as against this country alone, but it applies to the exportations of all countries to this country where a bounty is paid or an export tax is imposed.

Mr. LIPPITT. If the Senator is correct in his interpretation of that provision, of course it changes—

Mr. SIMMONS. If there is any question about it, I will read it into the Record, if it will not take too much of the Senator's time. I do not think I can possibly be mistaken about the meaning of it. The language is very plain, I think.

Mr. LIPPITT. I will confess to the Senator that it is so long since I have read that passage that I am not able at the moment to contradict the statement of the Senator from North Carolina. If he is correct, what I have said about the bounty

of Australia would not apply; if he is not correct, it would apply.

Mr. SIMMONS. I am correct; and I will read it if the Senator desires. I merely call his attention to it now because I was sure he did not want an incorrect statement to go into the Record.

Mr. LIPPITT. I can only say that in my statement I had the great authority of the Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot], and I thought I was correct.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, when the Senator from Rhode Island asked me if there was in the pending bill a provision that wherever a foreign country granted a bounty on the exportation of a manufactured article from that country the amount of that bounty or export tax would be added to the regular duty imposed on its admission to this country, I told him that my understanding was that wherever there was a discrimination against this country it would be added. For instance, if Australia gave a bounty to the manufacturers of Australian tops when those tops were shipped to the United States and did not give a bounty when they were shipped to any other country, that would be a discrimination against the United States.

But wherever Australia granted a bounty for the manufacture of tops in Australia for general exportation, whether to the United States or to any other country, my understanding is that that would not be added.

Mr. SIMMONS. Does the Senator get that understanding after reading the act? Let me read the act. I think it is important that I should. Clearly the Senator is mistaken, if that is his construction.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not say that it is my construction after reading it.

Mr. LIPPITT. To save time, unless there is objection, I suggest that the paragraph to which the Senator from North Carolina refers may be included in my remarks without reading.

Mr. SIMMONS. Then I ask that paragraph E, page 254, be included in my interruption.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, it will be so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

E. That whenever any country, dependency, colony, province, or other political subdivision of government shall pay or bestow, directly or indirectly, any bounty or grant upon the exportation of any article or merchandise from such country, dependency, colony, province, or other political subdivision of government, and such article or merchandise is dutiable under the provisions of this act, then upon the importation of any such article or merchandise into the United States, whether the same shall be imported directly from the country of production or otherwise, and whether such article or merchandise is imported in the same condition as when exported from the country of production or has been changed in condition by remanufacture or otherwise, there shall be levied and paid, in all such cases, in addition to the duties otherwise imposed by this act, an additional duty equal to the net amount of such bounty or grant, however the same be paid or bestowed. The net amount of all such bounties or grants shall be from time to time ascertained, determined, and declared by the Secretary of the Treasury, who shall make all needful regulations for the identification of such articles and merchandise and for the assessment and collection of such additional duties.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, I was about to discuss the change that has been made by the Senate committee in paragraph 298 with regard to flannels. As that paragraph came from the House there was a duty upon flannels of 25 per cent ad valorem; but flannels composed wholly or in chief value of wool valued at above 50 cents a pound were made dutiable at 35 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, I was not in the Chamber when the Senator was speaking on the subject of tops. I simply wish to ask him if he has made any investigation or has any information with reference to the actual percentage of cost of making tops?

Mr. LIPPITT. I will say to the Senator from New Jersey that I spent nearly an hour in trying to tell what I knew on that subject.

Mr. HUGHES. Will the Senator tell me, roughly, what he finds the percentage of cost to be?

Mr. LIPPITT. I should prefer not to go into all of that again.

Mr. HUGHES. Just the percentage.

Mr. LIPPITT. I will say that, arguing from the table on page 642, I think, of the Tariff Board report, I made the cost of the kind of tops referred to in that table 11.9 cents a pound. I also stated that three or four other people whom I had given me information, either from the report itself or from their own factories, gave me figures that were in substantial accord with that, and that the average of seven different figures of that kind was 11.8 cents a pound.

To return to paragraph 298, the Senate committee has proposed a change in the duty upon flannels costing above 50 cents

a pound by which it would be reduced from 35 per cent to 25 per cent. Thirty-five per cent duty is exactly the same as all woolen cloth, with some few exceptions, is given under this bill. As the bill came from the House high-cost flannels and woolen cloth of the same quality would have received exactly the same duty, 35 per cent ad valorem; but under this bill the duty on high-priced flannels has been reduced 10 per cent.

What I wish to say on that subject is that the cost of making a flannel of the same construction and quality is no less than the cost of making a piece of woolen cloth of that construction and quality that has not been napped. The major difference between the two kinds of cloth is that one has been napped in finishing and the other has been treated in a different manner. I can not see the justice or the propriety of leaving a duty of 35 per cent on the woolen cloth and putting only 25 per cent upon the flannel, which is made in the same way and at the same cost.

I have here a few samples of some of the very beautiful flannels that are made in this country and that would be included in this duty. I do not know exactly what the committee had in mind in making the change; but it rather seems to me, without making any insinuations, that the committee could not have been thoroughly informed as to the wide range of very beautiful fabrics on which they were making this discrimination.

Further than that, the description which is given of these goods above 50 cents a pound that shall pay only 25 cents duty is that they are "flannels." It would seem quite within the range of possibility that woolen cloth which had not been napped, by being simply named flannel, might be brought in under that paragraph at 25 per cent, instead of 35 per cent.

I referred a few days ago to the great controversy that went on in the cotton trade over the word "etamine." The courts decided in that case that unless a fabric was called an etamine it was not an etamine; it made no difference what its construction was. The word was used in the tariff of that day exactly the same as the word "flannels" is used in this paragraph now. I do not know, of course, whether the court would take the opposite side of that position and say that what is called a flannel is a flannel. But it is a construction of the paragraph that is very well open to consideration.

Therefore I simply wanted to bring to the attention of the Senators who are going to act as the conferees on the part of this body what seemed to me to be a discrimination against high-grade flannels, as compared with woolen goods, when the duty has been made 25 per cent on one and 35 per cent on the other.

The woolen business is peculiar in one respect. It has brought to this country a very large percentage of foreign capital, particularly in the State of Rhode Island—a condition which, so far as I know, has not prevailed to anything like the same extent, if at all, in the other sister textiles. I have especially in mind a factory which, shortly after the passage of the Dingley bill, an Englishman, believing the policy of that measure would be the permanent policy of the United States, brought to Rhode Island. On a meadow that had been used for nothing more important than the occasional pasture of cattle, and beside a stream whose waters from time immemorial had run unused to the ocean, he built a mill, and in conjunction with that factory he built a model New England mill village.

He had for many years been employed in manufacturing cloth in England to be sold in this country, and had prospered in doing so. He invested in this plant, to become a part of the wealth of this Nation, money which had been made from the export of English goods to America.

With it he bought all the great variety of things that go into the construction of such an establishment—American brick and wood, and iron, American engines, boilers, and electrical machines, shafting, and machinery. He employed in doing so American masons, bricklayers, carpenters, machinists, painters, and men in all the other departments of the building trades. To construct his houses and gardens, he again distributed among the workers in all the great varieties of employments that are necessary to construct a home, from the day laborer to the architect, part of the money that he had brought here.

Since his factory has started the mill and its employees have been constant customers for American products. The mill has been run on American coal, and the workers of it have been fed on the products of American farms. I will not attempt to enumerate all the varied products for which the establishment of this plant has, in some proportion or other, helped to increase the market. But I do not believe I would exaggerate if I said that there was not a section or State, and scarcely a village perhaps, whose people have not to some extent shared in the benefit of this industry.

The raw material which it uses is mohair, and the amount which it uses furnishes no immaterial part of the demand for that product in America. Not long ago the manager told me that when they first came here the market for this article was so uncertain that the growers consigned it to commission houses to be sold for such a price as they might be able to get, but that to-day they were frequently able to make contracts for their production before it was clipped.

We have seen in the preparation of this bill the representatives of the great State of Texas urging the placing of a duty of 20 per cent on what has become to that State, far distant from Rhode Island, an important and profitable industry. Not long ago I saw a statement in the daily press that the farmers of Utah were rejoicing in the fact of the profit they had made this year from their clip of mohair. I will read what the New York Times of May 11, 1912, had to say about that matter. This is dated Salt Lake, Utah, May 11, 1912:

Some enterprising stockmen several years ago concluded that the Rocky Mountains furnished a good place for breeding goats, and sent for some fine specimens to Switzerland and other mountain regions abroad. It was found that the goats could live on parts of the ranges where sheep or cattle would not thrive.

I should like particularly to emphasize the benefit that came to that State by the utilization of its waste land:

This was particularly true of San Juan County, in the southeast corner of the State, which is largely given over to sand. There are now 20,000 goats in San Juan getting a good living and yielding profits. One herd in near-by Kane County numbers 13,000. It has been found that the goats are less subject to severe climatic changes than the sheep or even the cattle, and they have come through the recent winter with few losses, whereas many of the other animals have died.

The clip from the goats now here is expected to give a profit of about \$60,000 this year.

I wonder, Mr. President, how many of the farmers of the State of Texas, whose representatives have been not the least active in voting for the Democratic tariff policy, or even the farmers of the State of Utah, whose representatives have been consistent supporters of the policy that made their rejoicing possible, realize in how direct a way their market was the result of the triumph of Republican protection in 1897.

The managers of that factory are still running in England to-day for the European trade a factory making the same fabrics they make in this country under the same conditions, on the same machinery, but out of Asiatic mohair. They have recently submitted figures showing that under this proposed bill they can make these fabrics in their English factory and land them in New York with the duty paid at prices from 6 to 15 cents a yard less than they can make them for in their Rhode Island mills. And they say that if that law is enacted this circumstance will compel them largely, if not entirely, to supply the American market with their English-made goods, which means throwing people out of employment in Rhode Island and taking away the market from the farmers of Utah and of Texas.

Mr. President, I had a letter yesterday from an employee of this factory. I thought I had it here, but in some way it has become mislaid. It was written without any solicitation on my part. In that letter he stated that already three-quarters of the looms running in that establishment had been stopped, that 100 families had left their homes here and returned to England, and that more than 100 of the other people, including himself, were trying to obtain positions as motormen and various positions of that kind.

This is but one of several large manufacturing plants that have within a few years been built with foreign capital in the little State of Rhode Island and on account of the Republican tariff policy. I shall not undertake to read the names in detail, but they are factories whose owners have come from France and Belgium and England. All told, they employ some seven or eight thousand people. That means, perhaps, a population of 30,000 people. It has been strenuously urged in this Chamber that the tariff had nothing to do with the adversity that existed when the Democratic Party was in power in the nineties and the prosperity that has come about since the Republican policy was put upon the statute books in the form of the Dingley law in 1897.

I am not one of those who believe that the change in our tariff policy was the only cause of these different conditions, but I am one who believes it was a very considerable cause, and I submit that the coming here of such industries as these, whose benefits are felt from one end of this country to the other, is a forcible illustration of the different ways in which these two policies operate.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, it is 6 o'clock. I should like to make an inquiry of some of the Senators on the other side. I hardly know just whom to address, but I will address myself to Senators who are on the Finance Committee. The Senator

from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] is the ranking member of the minority; the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] is a very active and leading member of that committee; and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] is a member of the committee and the titular leader of the minority of the Senate. I should like to ask of these gentlemen, if they can tell me, about how much more time is likely to be occupied in this debate. Do any of these Senators know whether other Senators are contemplating delivering set speeches on this schedule?

Mr. PENROSE. I should like—

Mr. STONE. I wish to say I am merely trying to get information.

Mr. PENROSE. In return, I should like to ask the Senator from Missouri whether it is the intention of the majority to reply to some of the unanswerable arguments that they have been listening to.

Mr. STONE. It has been suggested to me that it would be very difficult to reply to an unanswerable argument.

Mr. PENROSE. I have often seen the attempt made, even if it were impossible.

Mr. STONE. So far as I am concerned, what I want to do is to make some progress with the bill and get to a vote. It seems to me that we have had it sufficiently debated. A great many speeches were made at this session on wool before this schedule was taken up. It has been the subject of exhaustive discussion. We have had several very able and prolonged speeches; the whole day has been taken—I am far from saying it has been wasted—in speech making by our friends on the other side. They were very able speeches, I will say, but really, with all due deference, I am compelled to say, without anything new in what they have been saying. We have heard these same speeches during this session of Congress. It is merely piling one speech of the same kind upon another speech of like kind. I am curious to know, if some Senator will do me the kindness of telling me, whether there are some more of them to be made to-morrow.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

Mr. WARREN. If the Senator will allow me, I want to suggest that there will be some more speeches on the wool-growers' side. We have had three very good speeches on the other side of the Chamber. They are not all in print yet, and they will have to be answered, of course. It will take some little time; but I want to say to the Senator from Missouri, if I may still be permitted, that compared with the times heretofore when Schedule K has been considered I think the Senator is getting along quite well. From what I know as to the point to which the debate will lead, it is my opinion that it will only be a very short matter, and that the Senator will have distinguished himself in putting Schedule K through in only a fraction of the time that has been occupied whenever it has been up for consideration before.

Mr. STONE. Will the Senators on the other side and the Senate agree that at 5 o'clock to-morrow we shall take a vote on this schedule?

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, as the Senator honored me by mentioning my name, and as I have been endeavoring to guide somewhat the discussion on this side of the Chamber, I will say to the Senator that unquestionably there are other speeches to be made on this schedule.

Mr. STONE. There are other speeches to be made?

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes. Whether they will be concluded to-morrow or not, I can not say, but possibly they may be concluded. On the general subject of the tariff, before we come to a vote on the final passage of the bill, there will be some speeches made, perhaps not many.

Mr. STONE. I am speaking of this schedule.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator is speaking of this schedule. I feel, Mr. President, that we got along admirably yesterday; that we made great progress. These speeches had to be delivered, and the others that have been prepared will have to be delivered. I do not think the Senator to-night ought to ask that we should agree to a time to vote on this schedule. I feel sure that if the Senator will remain patient, as he always does, the progress will be satisfactory to the Senator himself.

I think it is safe to say, Mr. President, that on this side of the Chamber there is the same feeling which exists on the other side, that we ought to press this matter as rapidly as the importance of the subject demands. But we of course expect from the other side what was accorded to that side in the debate four years ago, an opportunity to express our views in a proper way. I know the Senator would not wish to curtail that privilege.

Mr. STONE. I do not wish to curtail it, and I could not if I wished. I think the information I desired to elicit I have obtained. I am not at all gratified with what I hear, but I hope

to get through with it. I did want to know just how long this interminable debate would last.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will venture to suggest, Mr. President, that if the Senator does not unduly press the matter he will be more gratified to-morrow evening than he is this evening, so far as progress is concerned.

Mr. STONE. That is all. I ask that the bill be laid aside for the day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be laid aside.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. BACON. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After six minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 6 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, August 23, 1913, at 11 o'clock a. m.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate August 22, 1913.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS.

Lieut. Col. George A. Zinn to be colonel.
Maj. William W. Harts to be lieutenant colonel.
Capt. Francis A. Pope to be major.
First Lieut. James J. Loving to be captain.
Second Lieut. Paul S. Reinecke to be first lieutenant.

INFANTRY ARM.

First Lieut. George A. Herbst to be captain.
First Lieut. Philip J. Lauber to be captain.
First Lieut. Thomas M. Hunter to be captain.
First Lieut. Gad Morgan to be captain.
Second Lieut. Barton K. Yount to be first lieutenant.
Second Lieut. Denham B. Crafton to be first lieutenant.
Second Lieut. William E. Selbie to be first lieutenant.
Second Lieut. John L. Jenkins to be first lieutenant.
Second Lieut. Charles H. White to be first lieutenant.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY.

GENERAL OFFICERS.

Col. John P. Wisser to be brigadier general.
Col. Thomas F. Davis to be brigadier general.

COAST ARTILLERY CORPS.

Charles Linnell Austin to be second lieutenant.

MEDICAL RESERVE CORPS.

To be first lieutenants.

Frederic Victor Beitler.
John Jordan Boaz.
Paul Eugene Bowers.
Carl Raimund Hiller.
Peter McCall Keating.
Harvey Adams Moore.
Firmadage King Nichols.
Blanchard Beecher Pettijohn.
Palmer Augustus Potter.
Llewellyn Powell.
James Albert Robertson.
Edward Percy Simpson.
Frederick Albert Tucker.
Edward Mason Parker.

POSTMASTERS.

MICHIGAN.

E. T. Belding, Mancelona.
Isaac C. Wheeler, Manton.

NORTH DAKOTA.

John M. Baer, Beach.
W. O. Lowden, McHenry.
Pearl Miller, La Moure.

OHIO.

W. T. Alberson, New Philadelphia.
Benjamin G. Trew, Shawnee.
George J. Windle, Sebring.

OKLAHOMA.

Marion B. Carley, Geary.
C. J. Woodson, Okarche.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Robert E. Urell, Mansfield.

TENNESSEE.

John T. Clary, Bellbuckle.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, August 22, 1913.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God our Father, strengthen, we beseech Thee, our minds, our hearts, our hands to do Thy will as it is revealed unto us day by day; that no cloud may obscure the light of Thy countenance from our spiritual vision; that we may pass from victory unto victory, until Thou shalt call us from the endearing scenes of earth to the enchanting visions of the blest, and we will hallow Thy name forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL.

The Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, August 19, 1913, was read.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I desire to amend the Journal in this respect. I was appointed, together with the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. BURKE], on a special committee to investigate the question of tuberculosis among the Indians, and also on the question of irrigation of arid lands in the Yakima Indian Reservation in the State of Washington, those two objects, and I see that only one is covered in the Journal. I desire for the Journal to include both.

The SPEAKER. The Speaker supposes that he is responsible for that mistake in just announcing the one, believing the other would go with it.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. It may be necessary that both should appear.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Journal will be changed in that respect.

Mr. MANN. The Record is correct, and perhaps the Journal, but it was not read.

The SPEAKER. If the Journal does not contain the other half of the title it will be fixed. Without objection, the Journal as corrected will stand approved.

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TUESDAY NEXT.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet on Tuesday next.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet on Tuesday next. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

GOVERNOR OF THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from New Jersey rise?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I rise for the purpose of asking unanimous consent to make a brief statement of personal interest to each Member of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Jersey asks leave to make a personal statement of a few minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. Speaker, yesterday afternoon there was deposited in the general post office copies of the invitation which I am about to read. The committee signing this invitation thought it would be wise to have this announcement made, as it seems impossible to determine when the post office will deliver the invitations. It reads as follows:

In honor of Mr. HARRISON of New York, governor of the Philippine Islands, an informal reception will be given by the House of Representatives, Saturday evening, August 23. You are cordially invited.

At the home and lawn of Mr. KENT, 1925 F Street NW., August 23, 1913, 8 o'clock.

Mr. SPEAKER CLARK,
Mr. UNDERWOOD,
Mr. MURDOCK,
Mr. TOWNSEND,
Mr. MANN,
Mr. PALMER,
Mr. KENT,

Committee.

This will enable gentlemen having other engagements to cancel them. [Applause.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, in this connection and in behalf of this side of the House I desire to congratulate the President and the country upon the appointment of FRANCIS BURTON HARRISON to the high position of governor of the Philippine Islands. I believe that no better selection could have been made out of the entire population of the United States, and that the action of the President is a guaranty to the country that the Philippine question will receive careful and honest consideration. [Loud applause.]

TEMPERING HOT WINDS IN TEXAS, ETC.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I request unanimous consent after the regular order of the next day's session to address the House upon the subject of tempering the hot winds in western Texas, Oklahoma, and Kansas and making it possible to produce crops in those sections, and that without the expense of irrigation.

The SPEAKER. How much time does the gentleman ask?

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. Thirty minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I understand the gentleman's request is not to interfere with the regular business?

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. Yes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MURRAY] asks unanimous consent that at the next session of the House, after the routine business, reading of the Journal, and so forth, that he have 30 minutes in which to address the House on the subject of tempering the hot winds—

Mr. BUTLER. To the shorn lamb.

Mr. BATHURICK. To the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER (continuing). Of Texas, Oklahoma, and Kansas, not to interfere with public business. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—

Mr. QUIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand that this request will not interfere with the special order?

The SPEAKER. No; that is a part of the request.

Mr. QUIN. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. QUIN] is recognized.

Mr. QUIN. Reserving the right to object, I want to ask the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MURRAY] if he can not include the boll weevil in that request? [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I expect I am too late now, but I want to suggest that if you might put the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MURRAY] in cold storage in Washington City that that would temper the hot winds in Oklahoma. [Loud laughter.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the House a few days ago, by unanimous consent, gave to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORGAN] permission to address the House at the session one week ago. That session was adjourned out of respect to the memory of the late Senator from Alabama, Mr. Johnston. Last Tuesday I renewed that request. Objection was made by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK]. My colleague from Illinois [Mr. MCKENZIE] the other day asked unanimous consent that he might have leave to insert an article in the Record. Objection was made from that side of the House. My colleague [Mr. BRITTON] asked unanimous consent last Tuesday that he might extend his remarks in the Record. Objection was made from that side of the House. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SMITH] last Tuesday asked unanimous consent that he might extend his remarks in the Record. Objection was made from that side of the House. Now, if these courtesies are to be granted, they are to be granted without favor as from two sides of the House. While the Democratic side of the House is not responsible for the objection of some individual Member of it, it is out of the question to suppose that the minority will permit by unanimous consent Members of the majority to speak and to insert articles in the Record while that permission is denied to Members of the minority. I shall not object to this particular request at this time, but unless the same courtesy can be extended to Members of the minority, it can not be expected that the gentlemen will succeed in requests of this kind in the future.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MURDOCK. Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MURRAY] how much time he is going to take?

The SPEAKER. Thirty minutes. That is, he is allowed 30 minutes.

Mr. MURDOCK. My understanding is that a contested-election case, the MacDonald case from Michigan—

The SPEAKER. A contested-election case is a matter of the highest privilege.

Mr. MURDOCK. And will have the right of way?

The SPEAKER. Of course, it will have.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. BARNHART. I want to say something, and I do not know whether I want to reserve the right to object or not. If that privilege is passed—

The SPEAKER. It is not passed. The Chair has not asked whether there was objection or not.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to say a word about this matter of the insertion of newspaper articles, pamphlets, and so forth, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I am at the present time trying to secure an estimate of the cost to the Government of publishing all sorts of communications, relevant and irrelevant, that are offered from time to time under unanimous consent, inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and broadcasted to the country under the franking privilege at very great expense to the Government. Conspicuous among these during the past year was an article of faith by a Democrat, or alleged Democrat, from my own State that occupied pages and pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. BORLAND. What sort of an article was that?

Mr. BARNHART. It was a sort of an article of political faith. It ought to have been omitted from the RECORD, and in a conversation with divers and sundry Democrats and some Republicans we have reached a sort of an agreement that hereafter we are going to know what these articles mean which are inserted by unanimous consent, and unless they apply directly to the proceedings in hand objection will be made.

Mr. MURDOCK. Now, Mr. Speaker, what does the gentleman mean when he says "Unless they apply directly to the proceedings of Congress"? Suppose a banker in Chicago writes a pamphlet upon the currency question and a request is made that that be printed in the RECORD, would that come under the prohibition?

Mr. BARNHART. I should think it ought.

Mr. MANN. That would have to be disposed of by a Democratic caucus. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

The SPEAKER. The regular order is, Is there objection?

Mr. MURDOCK. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART] just what this cabal or combination is?

The SPEAKER. The regular order is putting the question. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 2419. An act permitting minors of the age of 18 years or over to make homestead entry or other entry of the public lands of the United States; and

S. 1673. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to grant further extensions of time within which to comply with the law and make proof on desert-land entries in the counties of Grant and Franklin, State of Washington.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1353) to authorize the board of county commissioners of Okanogan County, Wash., to construct and maintain a bridge across the Okanogan River at or near the town of Malott.

The message also announced that, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914," approved June 30, 1913, the Vice President had appointed as members of the Joint Commission to Investigate Indian Affairs the following Members of the Senate: Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. LANE, and Mr. TOWNSEND.

The message also announced that in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for fulfilling treaty stipulations with the various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914," approved June 30, 1913, the Vice President had appointed Mr. ROBINSON and Mr. TOWNSEND as members on the part of the Senate of the commission to investigate the question of tuberculosis among the Indians in connection with an inquiry into the necessity and feasibility of establishing, equipping, and maintaining a tuberculosis sanitarium in New Mexico, and to inquire into the necessity and feasibility of procuring impounded waters for the Yakima Indian Reservation.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bill of the following title:

S. 1353. An act to authorize the board of county commissioners of Okanogan County, Wash., to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Okanogan River at or near the town of Malott.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, Senate bills of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees as indicated below:

S. 1673. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to grant further extensions of time within which to comply with the law and make proof on desert-land entries in the counties of Grant and Franklin, State of Washington; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 2419. An act permitting minors of the age of 18 years or over to make homestead entry or other entry of the public lands of the United States; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota, by unanimous consent, was granted leave of absence for one week, on account of important business.

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House a request from Mr. EDWARDS for leave of absence, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., August 19, 1913.

HON. CHAMP CLARK,

Speaker House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: In response to telegrams advising me of the critical illness of my brother, Hon. Robert H. Edwards, I am leaving for Savannah, Ga., this afternoon.

I realize the importance of all Democrats being closely in attendance upon their duties in Washington at this time, and of course I hate very much to be absent. I feel, however, that I should go to the bedside of my brother.

I will appreciate it very much if you will see that a leave of absence is granted to me indefinitely on account of this illness, and will also appreciate it if you will have this letter incorporated in the RECORD, in order that the RECORD will show the cause of my absence.

Thanking you, I am,

Yours, respectfully,

CHAS. G. EDWARDS.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

CONTESTED-ELECTION CASE.

Mr. POST, from the Committee on Elections No. 1, submitted a privileged report (H. Res. 231, H. Rept. 60) of that committee in the contested-election case of William J. MacDonald against H. Olin Young, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

Mr. POST. I give notice, Mr. Speaker, that I shall call up the case on Tuesday of next week.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Post] gives notice that he will call it up next Tuesday.

CLERK AND JANITOR FOR THE COMMITTEE ON ROADS.

Mr. LLOYD rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. LLOYD. For the purpose of offering a privileged resolution from the Committee on Accounts.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. LLOYD] submits a privileged resolution from the Committee on Accounts. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 119 (H. Rept. 55).

Resolved, That the chairman of the Committee on Roads be, and he is hereby, authorized to appoint a clerk for said committee at an annual salary of \$2,000, and a janitor to said committee at the rate of \$60 per month, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House until otherwise provided by law.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, this resolution provides for the usual clerk and janitor that are given to the large committees of the House. The Committee on Roads was created at the beginning of this session of Congress, and it is necessary for it to have these officers.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman a question on this subject?

Mr. LLOYD. Certainly.

Mr. BARTLETT. I have no objection to the resolution, but there are a number of committees that are entitled to session clerks, ordinarily committees to investigate the various departments of the Government. May I inquire if those committees have yet been provided with session clerks at this session of Congress?

Mr. LLOYD. They have not.

Mr. BARTLETT. I understand that there are certain committees that have matters that ought to be investigated by them, and that the reason there have been no investigations of those matters by the committees to investigate expenditures in the various departments is because they have no clerks. Is that true?

Mr. LLOYD. I think that is true.

Mr. BARTLETT. Does not the gentleman think it important also if those committees are to investigate the departments which they were appointed to investigate and which they are

expected to investigate that they be given the machinery by which they can do so?

Mr. LLOYD. There is a resolution now pending before the Committee on Accounts—

Mr. BARTLETT. And it has been pending all this session, as I understand—

Mr. LLOYD. Providing for annual clerks for these several committees. There will be some action taken on that resolution within the next few days.

Mr. BARTLETT. I am not a member of any of these expenditure committees, but I suggested to the chairman of one of them the importance of making an investigation of certain matters, and the chairman said he could not do it, because he had no clerical help.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Missouri yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Missouri yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. LLOYD. Yes.

Mr. MANN. As I understand, this resolution proposes to provide the ordinary employees for a committee of the class to which the Roads Committee belongs?

Mr. LLOYD. Yes.

Mr. MANN. From what time does the employment date?

Mr. LLOYD. It will be from the date of the appointment of the clerk. It will be after this date, of course.

Mr. MANN. The employees have not yet been appointed?

Mr. LLOYD. No, sir.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LLOYD. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. Do I understand the gentleman to say that it is contemplated to give clerks to all the expenditure committees?

Mr. LLOYD. No; a request of that kind has been made in a resolution that is now pending before the Committee on Accounts. No action has been taken as to whether they shall be annual clerks or session clerks.

Mr. MURDOCK. They have neither at present?

Mr. LLOYD. Neither.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution. The resolution was agreed to.

CLERK TO COMMITTEE ON ELECTION OF PRESIDENT, VICE PRESIDENT, AND REPRESENTATIVES IN CONGRESS.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I have another privileged resolution.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 188 (H. Rept. 57).

Resolved, That the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress be, and is hereby, allowed an annual clerk at a salary at the rate of \$2,000 per annum, from June 3, 1913, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House until otherwise provided by law.

Mr. BOOHER. Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the chairman of the committee a question. Is not this committee already provided with a session clerk?

Mr. LLOYD. No; it is provided with no clerk at the present time.

Mr. BOOHER. It has always had a session clerk.

Mr. LLOYD. It has always had a session clerk, and the gentleman will remember that during the last Congress the question was raised as to whether this committee should have an annual clerk or a session clerk. The Committee on Accounts at that time recommended a session clerk. In the last Congress the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress was one of the active committees of the House. It was active during the whole of the Congress. It had legislation of the most important character which went upon the statute books, and we are assured that there are at the present time a number of very important matters pending before that committee; that it has a vast amount of correspondence, and the chairman of that committee insists that he ought to have an annual clerk. The Committee on Accounts, which two years ago recommended only a session clerk, are now led to believe that this committee is of sufficient importance to entitle it to an annual clerk.

Mr. BOOHER. Mr. Speaker, I think the argument of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. LLOYD] is a complete answer to his request to have this clerk appointed. He says now that at the last session of Congress a great deal of business was before this committee. He does not complain that it was not properly attended to. It was properly attended to. Every bill that was before the committee was reported out and passed by this House. Now, if a session clerk was sufficient in the last Congress, it seems to me that this clerkship ought not to be raised to a

\$2,000 position for the reason given by my colleague, and I hope the resolution will be defeated.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, during the last Congress it is true, as I stated, that there was a session clerk, who was paid \$6 per day during the session. This does not add very much to the expenses, as far as the House of Representatives is concerned. We do not hesitate now to say that if other committees, numbers of them, are to receive salaries of \$2,000 a year for their clerks, having annual clerks, that this committee is one, beyond any question, that is entitled to the same recognition.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LLOYD. Certainly.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. I would like to ask the gentleman from Missouri if he does not think that any committee of this House that needs a clerk during the session ought not to have an annual clerk?

Mr. LLOYD. I think that is a very important question and worthy of consideration by the membership of this House. I am inclined to the view that any committee that is entitled to be appointed, that does any considerable service for the House of Representatives, is entitled to an annual clerk. That is my candid judgment about it. We have committees that ought not to be appointed at all that are not entitled to any clerk whatever.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. I want to say to the gentleman that I am a member of one of the expenditure committees in this House. It has a clerk who, I think, is as faithful and as efficient, who works as many hours in the day and as many days in the year, as the clerk of any committee, and it has occurred to me that a clerk employed as a clerk of that committee is employed ought to be on the annual roll. It also occurs to me that if a committee needs a clerk at all he ought to be a clerk who can be employed annually, so that you will not be taking on some man who is inexperienced at every session of Congress. A clerk who has been connected with the committee for some time becomes very efficient and very useful to the committee, and therefore I believe in the interest of economy and good administration, if a committee of this House needs a clerk during the session, that clerk ought to be put on the annual roll.

Mr. BATHRICK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LLOYD. Certainly.

Mr. BATHRICK. Does this Committee on Elections No. 1—

Mr. LLOYD. This is not the Committee on Elections No. 1; it is the Committee on Election of President and Vice President.

Mr. BATHRICK. Does the committee have any jurisdiction over matters except those that may arise in connection with the election of President and Vice President?

Mr. LLOYD. Yes; it has jurisdiction of woman suffrage, and these matters go to that committee. It has jurisdiction of all constitutional questions affecting the election of President and Vice President; on all questions of primaries as to how Presidents shall be elected; and the question of campaign contributions also goes to that committee.

Mr. BATHRICK. Is not the most of the work of that committee finished in the year in which the President and Vice President are elected?

Mr. LLOYD. No; it is a continuous work. I am assured at the present time, although I have made no careful investigation, that there are a number of important bills now pending before the committee that vitally affect the interests of the country.

Mr. BATHRICK. Now, if the gentleman will permit an observation, which I have tried on several occasions to find an opportunity to say, I do not object to any committee having sufficient help to properly conduct its business, but I wish to say that I am carrying, and have carried for over a year since I have been in the House, an expense of \$500 from my own funds to take care of the business of my office; and if we continue to extend these courtesies or necessities to chairmen every time they come in and want a new hand or a new appointment to make for their committee, we ought to take into consideration the wants of the Members of the House who are not chairmen of committees.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LLOYD. Certainly.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. How many committees are there without annual clerks?

Mr. LLOYD. About 20.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. This resolution provides for a clerk to one of these committees. It is not the intention of this committee to report any legislation at this session of Congress?

Mr. LLOYD. It is the intention of the committee to report legislation.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. At this session?

Mr. LLOYD. Yes. Perhaps I did not understand the gentleman. Does the gentleman mean to ask if the Committee on Accounts expects to report the resolutions referred to the Committee on Accounts?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. No; I asked if the Committee on Election of President and Vice President was to report any matters for legislation to Congress.

Mr. LLOYD. It is not authorized at this time, but that does not prevent the committee from doing work.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. There are about 20 committees of this House that are provided with session clerks, and of them you propose to select one and give that one an annual clerk. I submit this to the gentleman, that one of two propositions must be true, that if the committee has any work to do it ought to be provided with an annual clerk, and if there is no occasion for the existence of the committee it ought not to exist and ought not to have any clerk at all. Now, it occurs to me it would be the part of wisdom for the Committee on Accounts not to press this to-day but to take up this matter on a broader scale and to examine and to see which of these committees ought to have annual clerks and report a general resolution providing an annual clerk for every one of them, and in that investigation ascertain which committees ought not to exist and abolish those committees. Therefore I hope the gentleman will take that course and not select one committee out of 20 to be provided for to-day, as in my opinion the facts will develop there is no more reason why that committee should have an annual clerk than would apply to several of these other committees.

I do not mean by that to suggest that this committee is not entitled to a clerk. I think it is. I think the others are, too. Probably every one of these committees that exist ought to have an annual clerk. It is impossible here, certainly it is impossible or very difficult, to bring a man to Washington for \$125 a month in a long session to work for six months, and when Congress adjourns the 1st of July he must give up his job, and in a short session he stays three months and gives up his job. The result is you are not able to bring from your district a man who is competent to discharge the duties of committee clerk, and you have to pick him up here in Washington.

Mr. BATHRICK. Will the gentleman yield to me in the time of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. I am imposing on the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Lloyd].

Mr. LLOYD. That is all right.

Mr. BATHRICK. Is not the gentleman aware that many Members of this House have equal difficulty in securing a person from their district who can take care of the work of that office for the salary of \$125 a month, and is not the gentleman aware that many Members of this House are paying from their own funds money in order to get their work done properly?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Absolutely; and for that reason these clerks ought to be made annual clerks, and ought to be given a salary that is sufficient in amount to secure a man to do the work; but that reason applies not to any single committee, but to many of the committees.

Mr. BATHRICK. Does not the gentleman think it applies equally to clerks of Members of the House who are not chairmen of committees?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. No; I do not.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, the argument—

Mr. BATHRICK. I disagree with the gentleman.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, the argument presented by the gentleman from Mississippi is a splendid argument in favor of the resolutions now pending before the Accounts Committee, but that committee has carefully investigated this matter and believes this committee is entitled to its clerk.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LLOYD. I do.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress has become one of the important committees of the House. This morning the Committee on Elections reported the MacDonald case, and, as I understand, they decided that the failure to comply with the publicity law by filing a statement of receipts and expenditures required by that law is not any reason for refusing to seek or retain a seat in the House. Under that decision, which I take it will be accepted and become a rule of the House hereafter, it is quite certain the publicity law will need to be revised, as the present provisions of the law practically amount to nothing so far as any offense is concerned of a failure to comply with it. Nobody has ever and probably nobody ever will be prosecuted under the existing law even if a prosecution lies, which I doubt. That will require a revision

of the law, which I understand the chairman of that distinguished committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER], has undertaken to prepare, and therefore I think that the committee is entitled to an annual clerk, that being an important legislative committee.

I do not agree with some of the gentlemen that all of the committees ought to have annual clerks. Those committees which have to deal with permanent legislation, where the propositions drag out from year to year, and which require constant and long-continued consideration by a committee, ought to have an annual clerk. Those committees which are simply making investigations probably do not require an annual clerk. Some of the committees which only act upon sporadic cases of legislation probably do not require an annual clerk. I think that this committee is entitled to the annual clerk proposed.

Mr. BROCKSON rose.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. BROCKSON].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Delaware [Mr. BROCKSON] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. BROCKSON. I desire to inquire of the chairman of the committee why he provides a separate janitor for this committee? Is it the practice to have a separate janitor for all the committees?

Mr. LLOYD. All the big committees have a separate janitor. Mr. BROCKSON. Notwithstanding the fact that a number of janitors are employed about the building?

Mr. LLOYD. Yes, sir. There is an amendment there which I would like to have the Clerk report.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, in line 3, by striking out the word "allowed" and inserting the words "authorized to appoint," and in line 2 strike out the words "from June 3, 1913."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

PURCHASE AND EXCHANGE OF TYPEWRITERS.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 164 (H. Rept. 59).

Resolved, That the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives be, and is hereby, authorized to contract, with the approval of the Committee on Accounts, for the purchase or exchange of typewriters for the use of the House, upon such terms as he may deem prudent and equitable, and for such period of time as may be authorized by the Committee on Accounts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the resolution?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is the title "Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives" the correct one?

Mr. LLOYD. The Chief Clerk has authority to make those purchases. I think that is the proper officer.

Mr. MANN. I know he is the chief clerk in the Clerk's office.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like the gentleman to tell us about the history of the typewriter contract. My understanding is that when the House Office Building was constructed the typewriters were purchased as furniture. Is that correct?

Mr. LLOYD. I think, if you put it that way, it is correct. When the House Office Building was constructed, and we went into the offices there, every individual Member was permitted to have a typewriter at the Government expense.

Mr. MURDOCK. Now, right there. Then after all the offices of the building were equipped, thereafter were new typewriters purchased from time to time or were new typewriters traded in?

Mr. LLOYD. New typewriters were purchased sometimes and exchanged sometimes, but the purpose of this resolution is to authorize the Clerk to make a contract of exchange. There is a question now as to whether he has a right to exchange typewriters, and he has an opportunity to make a splendid contract by which typewriters when they become old and inefficient for use may be exchanged for new ones.

Mr. MURDOCK. Of course, with a cash addition. Now, I want to know what appropriation carries that cash addition for typewriters when a typewriter is purchased and an old typewriter is given in exchange?

Mr. LLOYD. The furniture account.

Mr. MURDOCK. Still the furniture account?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman's resolution apparently does confer this right to make contracts on the chief clerk in the Clerk's office.

Mr. LLOYD. I am willing to accept an amendment to leave out the word "chief."

Mr. MANN. The rule provides that the Clerk shall make all contracts, and that when he is absent the Chief Clerk shall act in his place.

Mr. LLOYD. Yes. As an amendment, Mr. Speaker, I wish to strike out the word "chief" where it appears in line 1.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by striking out, in line 1, the word "chief."

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, unanimous consent was not given.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this resolution? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, line 1, by striking out the word "chief."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution as amended.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

STENOGRAPHER TO THE COMMITTEE ON WAR CLAIMS.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following privileged resolution from the Committee on Accounts.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 141 (H. Rept. 58).

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House for the services of a stenographer to the Committee on War Claims during the sessions of the Sixty-third Congress compensation at the rate of \$75 per month, payment to commence from the time said stenographer entered upon the discharge of his duties, which shall be ascertained and evidenced by the chairman of said committee.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, let the committee amendment be read.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by striking out all of the resolution after the word "House," in line 2, and inserting the following: "the sum of \$150 to V. L. Almond for services rendered as stenographer to the Committee on War Claims from June 5, 1913, to August 5, 1913."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I did not quite understand what the amendment was.

Mr. LLOYD. This resolution provides for a stenographer for the Committee on War Claims. It has been customary heretofore to give the Committee on War Claims a session stenographer. The amendment of the Committee on Accounts provides for two months' salary for the stenographer, and the Committee on War Claims agreed to get along without a stenographer for the rest of the period of the extra session.

Mr. MANN. That is, the resolution provides for only—

Mr. LLOYD. Only two months' salary at the rate of \$75 per month.

Mr. MANN. Why is not a stenographer authorized and necessary to do this committee work?

Mr. LLOYD. The clerks can perform the duty. It is not necessary to have the stenographer.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Missouri yield?

Mr. LLOYD. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. There has been some discussion as to the practice of providing annual clerks in place of the session clerks that are usually provided. What is the ordinary or usual pay of a session clerk?

Mr. LLOYD. A session clerk of an expenditure committee receives \$125 per month. A session clerk of any other committee receives \$6 per day.

Mr. MONDELL. An annual clerk, if provided for, would receive what amount?

Mr. LLOYD. Whatever the House would agree upon.

Mr. MONDELL. I mean, ordinarily.

Mr. LLOYD. About \$1,500. That is what they are asking.

Mr. MONDELL. Then, so far as the expense is concerned, in these days when we are in session all the time, there is no difference in the matter of expense between \$125-per-month clerks by the month and a \$1,500 clerk by the year. On the other hand, as to those clerks who are paid \$6 a day, if the

House is to remain in session the greater part of the year they are receiving higher compensation than they would if they were on an annual salary.

Mr. MANN. They are not getting anything now.

Mr. LLOYD. They would receive \$6 a day during the session.

Mr. MANN. There are no \$6-a-day clerks now, are there?

Mr. LLOYD. Yes.

Mr. MANN. They are not, according to my understanding, carried in the appropriation act.

Mr. LLOYD. They receive \$6 a day, except the clerks to expenditure committees.

Mr. MANN. The appropriation bill carries no provision for them during the special session?

Mr. LLOYD. No. No provision of the bill carries the salaries of session clerks at the extra session.

Mr. MANN. That is what I say.

Mr. MONDELL. But they are provided for and carried along, are they not?

Mr. LLOYD. The question raised by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] was that they are not paid.

Mr. MANN. I asked if they were paid.

Mr. MONDELL. Do I understand that there are no \$6-a-day session clerks now?

Mr. LLOYD. There is but one session clerk at \$6 a day, and there are no \$125-per-month session clerks.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution as amended.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

PAY OF CERTAIN WITNESSES.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I have one more privileged resolution. It is the last one.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 169 (H. Rept. 56).

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House is hereby authorized to pay, out of the contingent fund, to J. Fred Essary, Carl D. Groat, and Daniel O'Connell the sum of \$2.25 each, for attendance as witnesses before the special committee appointed under authority of House resolution 59, Sixty-third Congress, first session.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, this resolution simply provides for the payment of the three witnesses who appeared in the Glover contempt case.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield? Has not the Committee on Accounts authority to approve bills for the attendance of witnesses before committees without bringing resolutions into the House?

Mr. GARNER. Not for this special committee.

Mr. LLOYD. Not for special committees.

Mr. GARNER. Not unless authorized by the House, and this committee were not authorized to expend any money whatever.

Mr. MANN. I thought they were authorized to subpoena witnesses.

Mr. LLOYD. No.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

BUST OF WILLIAM PITT.

Mr. THACHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Senate joint resolution 64, which is now on the Speaker's table, be taken up for present consideration by the House.

This joint resolution was unanimously agreed to by the Senate, and is favorably recommended by the Library Committee. It gives permission to the President, at his personal request made to Congress, to accept a bust of William Pitt, to be placed in the White House.

Mr. BARTLETT. Is a similar resolution pending in the Senate?

Mr. THACHER. Yes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. THACHER] asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table a joint resolution to authorize the President to accept a bust of William Pitt.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield for a question—

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object—

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes; I understand that a similar bill has been reported from the Committee on the Library, although it is not on the calendar.

Mr. THACHER. It has.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. And that the Committee on the Library have acted favorably on this matter.

Mr. THACHER. We have recommended it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. And your purpose in asking unanimous consent is merely to expedite the passage of the resolution to-day?

Mr. THACHER. That is all.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I did not know that the Committee on the Library had acted upon the House joint resolution, because I am sure there has not been a quorum of the committee in the city for some time.

I should have no objection to Lady Paget and other ladies presenting a bust of William Pitt to the United States, but I question very much the propriety of inaugurating a custom of placing in the White House busts or representations of foreigners in any form whatever. The White House is now overcrowded with pictures of Presidents and their wives. In my opinion the White House ought to remain sacred to the representation of Americans.

There are many places where a bust of William Pitt can be properly placed without seeking to place it in the one place of all others in the United States that ought to be kept solely for American citizens, and for the present I shall object. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois objects.

Mr. THACHER. Mr. Speaker, may I have the privilege of replying to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois?

The SPEAKER. You can not reply to an objection.

Mr. MANN. I am perfectly willing to reserve the right to object.

Mr. THACHER. In the first place I want to contradict one statement made by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois. May I have that privilege?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois has withdrawn his objection temporarily.

Mr. THACHER. The gentleman from Illinois stated that he knew that we had had no quorum of our committee in Washington for some time back. Two of the members of that committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SLAYDEN] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BARTHOLDT], are attending The Hague peace convention as delegates.

The other three Members are the gentleman from New York [Mr. TEN EXCK], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BURKE], and myself. It is quite true that there was no quorum actually present in Washington. The President sent a message asking the gracious consent of Congress. That was on the 4th of August, and that message was read in this House. I presume the Members here heard it read. I tried to get hold of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BURKE]. I caused to be sent to him a copy of this joint resolution and a copy of the President's request, and he authorized his signature to the favorable recommendation of the resolution.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman from Massachusetts will allow me, I did not mean to criticize the committee for having made a report because there was no quorum. If the gentleman so understood me, and perhaps it was quite natural, I want to say that I did not mean it in that respect at all. I supposed that the committee had made no report, because I knew that there was no quorum here.

Mr. THACHER. I thought the gentleman did not quite understand the fact that I had consulted with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BURKE].

Mr. MANN. As far as that is concerned, the gentleman might consult them all and it would make no difference.

The SPEAKER. The rule or decision is that it takes an actual quorum gathered together at one place.

Mr. MANN. But, Mr. Speaker, I was not making any point upon that at all.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands that; the Chair was stating it for the information of all Members of the House, because this question was elaborately argued last summer in the matter of the Coosa River Dam proposition.

Mr. TEMPLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THACHER. Yes.

Mr. TEMPLE. This is a request to place a bust of William Pitt in the White House.

Mr. THACHER. A request came from the President of the United States asking permission of Congress, which he has to have, to accept a gift of the bust of William Pitt, whom he called the friend and champion of America, to be put in the White House.

Mr. TEMPLE. It seems to me that when it comes as a request from the President of the United States we ought to bear in mind those who have had the opportunity of visiting Windsor Castle that in the chamber known as the King's closet in that castle there is a fine oil painting of Thomas Jefferson, a signer of the Declaration of Independence. It seems to me that if that can be put in the King's closet at Windsor Castle, we might

put in the White House, at the request of the President of the United States, a bust of William Pitt. [Applause.]

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEMPLE. If I have any time.

Mr. THACHER. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MADDEN. I just want to say that I wonder whether Windsor Castle is not the private property of the King, and that he has a right to put there anything he sees fit.

Mr. THACHER. Mr. Speaker, I trust that my good friend from Illinois will withdraw his objection.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman from Massachusetts wants to address the House I will reserve the objection.

Mr. THACHER. The gentleman from Illinois said we had no room in the White House for a statue of William Pitt.

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman permit an interruption at that point?

Mr. THACHER. Certainly.

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman has used the name of William Pitt. Is it William Pitt, Lord Chatham, or his son William Pitt, the great parliamentary leader?

Mr. THACHER. The Earl of Chatham, that is his title, I believe.

The SPEAKER. It is the Earl of Chatham.

Mr. COOPER. Yes; the elder Chatham, our friend during the Revolution.

Mr. THACHER. That is true. Pittsburgh, Pa., and Pittsfield, in my own State, were named after the elder Pitt, who was born in 1708.

Mr. COOPER. When the gentleman asks permission to have put in the White House a statue or a bust of William Pitt, that would permit a bust or statue of William Pitt, the younger, and that is not the man at all.

Mr. THACHER. It is the elder Pitt, as I think we all understand. Now, I want to say a further word in regard to this matter. If there was one man at the time of the American Revolution who helped the cause of America it was William Pitt. We have found room here in this Hall to put a picture of a foreigner, Gen. Lafayette, and I do not believe the gentleman from Illinois objects to that. Lafayette came over here when he was a young man. I want to say also that this picture was painted by a foreigner. He came over a young man, gave up the best part of his life to assist in the cause of liberty.

In regard to William Pitt I want to give the gentleman a few facts. He was born in 1708. At the age of 27 he became a member of Parliament. Some 10 years afterwards he became paymaster of England, where he made a record for honesty in office much above that of some of his predecessors. He refused to take a single cent that did not properly belong to him. He refused to take any interest on Government deposits, which it had been generally the custom for his predecessors to take, and put the money in the Bank of England without receiving any interest. His record was fine throughout, a model of everything that was honest and statesmanlike.

Benjamin Franklin was his friend and he fought for the cause of American liberty just as much as though he had been here fighting on the battle field. In 1778 he came into Parliament an old man on crutches and made a speech in the cause of America. After the close he fell in convulsions and died a few weeks after, just as John Quincy Adams was taken out from this House of Representatives and died a few months afterwards. I think, on looking into the life of William Pitt, we will find he was a champion of the cause of liberty in England and in America, also, and I certainly trust that if not at this time that at some time later this will be passed.

Mr. SLOAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THACHER. Yes.

Mr. SLOAN. Is this the same William Pitt, Lord Chatham, who said during the course of the American Revolution that the colonists ought not and should not have the right to make even a horseshoe nail?

Mr. THACHER. William Pitt said he would never consent to taxing Americans without their consent.

Mr. SLOAN. I was taking a specific statement.

Mr. THACHER. I do not recall it.

Mr. SLOAN. I recall it distinctly.

Mr. THACHER. I think the gentleman is mistaken, and I would be glad to have the gentleman show me that statement.

Mr. SLOAN. The gentleman can find it in any history.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I have as great an admiration for William Pitt, Earl of Chatham, as any man on earth now living or who ever has lived, but I do not believe we ought to have this reproduction in the White House. It is easy enough to find a place to put the bust, and for the present I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois objects.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER. On what?

Mr. BRITTEN. I desire to show by statement my personal observation of what I consider the extreme necessity of the manufacture of torpedoes, from observations made by me during a recent visit to the torpedo station at Newport.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record on the subject of torpedoes. Is there objection?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Mr. Speaker, I do not think this is a good time for the discussion of that subject, and I object.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, if this concludes public business to come before the House this morning, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LEWIS] desires to address the House for 30 minutes, and I ask that he be given unanimous consent to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state to the House that there is a special order on this Hetch Hetchy bill, which was to have come up on the 15th of the month and was to be a continuing order. Now, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LEWIS] be permitted to address the House at this time for 30 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I understand that if this request for unanimous consent is given the gentleman from Maryland it will not interfere with the regular order?

The SPEAKER. It will not affect it at all.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I will say I would not make this request at this time to get in the way of the gentleman's bill if it were not for the fact that I intend to move that the House adjourn before 2 o'clock, because we are going to hold a Democratic caucus.

Mr. MANN. I understood the Hetch Hetchy bill was not to be brought up this morning.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to say I shall not object to the request of the gentleman from Alabama that the gentleman from Maryland may address the House because I told the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LEWIS] I would not object. Hereafter I shall object to any insertions in the Record, or extension of any remarks of any kind, until the Democratic side is willing to concede to the Republican side of the House ordinary courtesies.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not see any reason why one Member of the House should be given unanimous consent to address the House and another Member of the House refused such consent. My colleague has tried two or three times now to get the consent of the House to extend his remarks in the Record on the subject of torpedoes.

It is a subject in which all the American people are interested, and I have not any doubt but that the gentleman would be able to discourse upon it intelligently and instructively; but I shall object to any persons being given the right to address the House unless the gentleman from Illinois is given unanimous consent to extend his remarks.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. MADDEN. I have not the floor, I think.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Evidently these remarks grow out of the fact that I objected a few moments ago to the extension of remarks in the Record relating to the necessity for additional battleships and torpedoes. I objected for the reason that I did not regard this as an appropriate time to insert such matter in the Record, and not, of course, for any personal reasons relating to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN].

I do not possess the pleasure of the acquaintance of the gentleman from Illinois. Hence there is nothing personal in my objection to his request. If the gentlemen on the other side of the Chamber think that there is any reason why the subject of parcel post should not be discussed at this time, it is perfectly competent and proper for them to object to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as I stated—and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS] probably was not in the Hall at the time—every request made from this side of the House for more than a week to speak and extend remarks in the Record has been objected to by Members

on that side of the House. It is a pretty poor excuse to say that this is not a good time in which to discuss torpedoes.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I objected.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until Tuesday, August 26, 1913, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Acting Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of Arkansas River, Ark., below Dardanelle, Ark., with a view to the improvement of the navigation of said river (H. Doc. No. 202); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustration.

2. A letter from the Acting Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on examination of Licking River, Ky., with a view to the prevention of a cut-off at the town of Farmers, consideration being given to any tender of cooperation on the part of local interests (H. Doc. No. 201); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. CARTER, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 2711) to provide for the acquiring of station grounds by the Great Northern Railway Co. in the Colville Indian Reservation in the State of Washington, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 54), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. POST, from the Committee on Elections No. 1, to which was referred the resolution (H. Res. 231) declaring William J. MacDonald duly elected a Representative from the twelfth congressional district of Michigan, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 60), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. FLOOD, from the Committee on Foreign Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 2319) authorizing the appointment of an ambassador to Spain, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 37, pt. 2), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3085) granting a pension to Virginia M. Gaspard, and the same was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. RUBBY: A bill (H. R. 7516) to prohibit interference with commerce among the States and Territories and with foreign nations, and to remove obstructions thereto, and to prohibit the transmission of certain messages by telegraph, telephone, cable, or other means of communication between States and Territories and foreign nations; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LONERGAN: A bill (H. R. 7592) appropriating money for the improvement of the Connecticut River between Long Island Sound and Hartford, Conn.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. GARNER (by request): A bill (H. R. 7593) to establish in the Department of Agriculture a bureau to be known as the market bureau; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RAYBURN: A bill (H. R. 7594) to amend the act of Congress entitled "An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Red River and to establish it as a post road," approved January 28, 1910; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 7595) providing for the free importation of articles intended for foreign buildings and exhibits at the Panama-Pacific International Exposition, and for the protection of foreign exhibitors; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CONNELLY of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 7596) to increase the limit of cost of the United States post-office building at Beloit, Kans.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. KINKAID of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 7597) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide special rules and regulations for the opening to homestead entry of lands eliminated from the Nebraska National Forest Reserve by presidential proclamation March 1, A. D. 1913; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7598) permitting minors of the age of 18 years or over to make homestead entry or other entry of the public lands of the United States; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. MAHAN: A bill (H. R. 7599) granting two condemned cannon to the city of Rockville, Conn.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TAVENNER: A bill (H. R. 7600) regulating the salary of rural letter carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 7601) authorizing the Navy Department to offer and pay rewards for the detection of violations of the antitrust act of July 2, 1890; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. THOMAS: A bill (H. R. 7602) for the benefit of railway postal clerks; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7603) to erect a statue of Jefferson Davis in the Jefferson Davis Home Park, at Fairview, Ky.; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7604) to correct the military record and provide for the granting of pensions to survivors of certain battalions of Kentucky Militia; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7605) for the erection of a public building at Central City, Muhlenberg County, Ky.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7606) for the erection of a public building at Russellville, Logan County, Ky.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. L'ENGLE: A bill (H. R. 7607) to provide for the examination and survey of St. Lucie Inlet, Palm Beach County, Fla.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7608) to provide for the examination and survey of New River, Dade County, Fla.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7609) to provide for the examination and survey of Lake Worth Inlet, Palm Beach County, Fla.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. RUBEY: A bill (H. R. 7610) to establish a fish-cultural station in Shannon County, in the State of Missouri; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7611) to fix the mileage of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates in Congress; to the Committee on Mileage.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7612) to amend section 2 of an act approved April 19, 1908, entitled "An act to increase the pension of widows, minor children, etc., of deceased soldiers and sailors of the late Civil War, the War with Mexico, the various Indian wars, etc., and to grant a pension to certain widows of the deceased soldiers and sailors of the late Civil War"; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7613) to provide for the securing of deposits in postal savings banks in cities and towns of less than 10,000 inhabitants, by personal bonds or the bonds of bonding companies, when such deposits shall be deposited in National or State banks located in such cities or towns; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7614) to extend the provisions of the pension act of May 11, 1912, to the officers and enlisted men of all State militia and other State organizations that rendered service to the Union cause during the Civil War for a period of 90 days or more, and providing pensions for their widows, minor children, and dependent parents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7615) to authorize the payment of pensions monthly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7616) providing that the United States shall in certain cases make compensation for the use of high-

ways for carrying free rural-delivery mail; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 7617) to provide for warning signals for vessels working on wrecks or engaged in dredging or other submarine work; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. STEENERSON: A bill (H. R. 7618) to amend the new three-year homestead law; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. FERRIS: A bill (H. R. 7619) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Anadarko, in the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 7620) to provide for the appointment of a district judge in the middle and eastern judicial districts in the State of Tennessee, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SLOAN: A bill (H. R. 7621) authorizing the President of the United States to appoint certain persons in the Regular Army and place them upon the retired list; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RUBEY: A bill (H. R. 7622) to prohibit interference with commerce among the States and Territories and with foreign nations, and to remove obstructions thereto, and to prohibit the transmission of certain messages by telegraph, telephone, cable, or other means of communication between States and Territories and foreign nations; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7623) to prohibit interference with commerce among the States and Territories and with foreign nations, and to remove obstructions thereto, and to prohibit the transmission of certain messages by telegraph, telephone, cable, or other means of communication between States and Territories and foreign nations; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: Resolution (H. Res. 230) seeking information relative to the Monroe doctrine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. POST: Resolution (H. Res. 231) declaring that William J. MacDonald was elected a Representative to the Sixty-third Congress; to the House Calendar.

By Mr. HAWLEY: Memorial of the Legislature of Oregon, asking Congress to investigate the grain-bag monopoly; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, urging passage of a bill for relief of Harry Hill and others known as the "Sherman County settlers"; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GARNER: Memorial of the Legislature of Texas, favoring investigation and consideration of methods of marketing farm products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN: A bill (H. R. 7624) for the relief of William Pool; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7625) for the relief of Mathias Meyer; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ANDERSON: A bill (H. R. 7626) granting a pension to Thomas O'Reilly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7627) granting an increase of pension to Victoria Capon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 7628) granting an increase of pension to Christina Frank; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROCKSON: A bill (H. R. 7629) granting an increase of pension to Jacob C. Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7630) for the relief of George Hallman; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BURKE of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 7631) for the relief of Bert H. Clark, Gustaf A. Bengtson, Maud A. Graham, Grace A. Graham, Lee Hurley, Emma I. Gordon, Mabel H. Dwight, and Nellie A. Pardy; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 7632) granting an increase of pension to Maggie E. Parsons; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DENT: A bill (H. R. 7633) for the relief of the personal representative of Charles W. Hammond, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DOOLITTLE: A bill (H. R. 7634) granting an increase of pension to Allen C. Mager; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DYER: A bill (H. R. 7635) granting a pension to Edward Dodsworth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7636) granting a pension to Joseph Glass; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FREAR: A bill (H. R. 7637) granting a pension to John H. Rodemeyer; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7638) granting an increase of pension to Christopher Schwedus; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FRENCH: A bill (H. R. 7639) for the relief of Myron A. Brownlee; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GRIFFIN: A bill (H. R. 7640) for the relief of David Crowther; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 7641) granting a pension to John A. Seeber; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 7642) granting an increase of pension to George J. Horton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KINKAID of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 7643) granting a pension to Edward P. Child; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KONOP: A bill (H. R. 7644) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Kohl; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LEWIS of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 7645) granting a pension to Sarah A. Hamersly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MARTIN: A bill (H. R. 7646) granting an increase of pension to James Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7647) granting an increase of pension to Harvey Smith, alias Harvey Guthrie; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PALMER: A bill (H. R. 7648) granting an increase of pension to Elinor F. Rodenbough; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PEPPER: A bill (H. R. 7649) granting an increase of pension to Otto Burkart; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7650) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Donohoo; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7651) granting a pension to Nancy E. Brewer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7652) granting a pension to Letta E. Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7653) for the relief of Alfred R. Long; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. POST: A bill (H. R. 7654) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Whitmer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REILLY of Connecticut: A bill (H. R. 7655) granting an increase of pension to Isabella Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUBEY: A bill (H. R. 7656) granting a pension to Samuel H. Barr; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7657) granting an increase of pension to Avery H. Baucum; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7658) granting a pension to Elizabeth E. Bennett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7659) for the relief of John C. Bennett; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7660) granting a pension to Carrie Bradley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7661) granting an increase of pension to George Burgess; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7662) granting a pension to Sarah E. Burrese; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7663) granting a pension to Charles R. Carter; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7664) granting a pension to James W. Chaffin; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7665) for the relief of Cornelius Christ; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7666) granting a pension to Mary A. Clay; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7667) granting an increase of pension to George L. Clonts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7668) granting a pension to J. Frank Cornman; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7669) granting a pension to Minnie J. Cotrell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7670) granting a pension to James L. Cox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7671) granting a pension to Charles S. Davis; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7672) granting a pension to Julia A. Dugan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7673) granting an increase of pension to John Dowell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7674) granting an increase of pension to Moses H. Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7675) granting a pension to Addie Davidson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7676) granting a pension to Charles Edwards; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7677) for the relief of Absalom H. Eggers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7678) granting a pension to Virginia A. Elder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7679) granting a pension to J. F. Ellis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7680) granting a pension to John S. Ellis; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7681) granting a pension to Sylvania Engle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7682) granting an increase of pension to John F. Epperson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7683) granting a pension to Charles Etzel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7684) granting a pension to Bridget Fennessey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7685) granting an increase of pension to Marion A. Franklin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7686) granting an increase of pension to William H. Furber; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7687) granting a pension to John W. Gibson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7688) granting an increase of pension to David C. Hardy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7689) for the relief of Noah M. Harmon; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7690) granting a pension to David Hartman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7691) granting an increase of pension to William E. Hoover; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7692) granting a pension to John H. Hubbard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7693) granting an increase of pension to Robert Jolley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7694) granting a pension to George W. Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7695) granting a pension to Nancy D. Kelly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7696) for the relief of William Karch; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7697) granting a pension to Mamie Klethley; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7698) granting a pension to William F. Lacy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7699) granting an increase of pension to William G. Lane; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7700) for the relief of Henry J. McBroom; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7701) granting an increase of pension to James Manning; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7702) to correct the military record of Robert W. Marr; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7703) granting an increase of pension to Levi Maule; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7704) granting an increase of pension to Franklin A. Minor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7705) granting an increase of pension to William F. Monday; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7706) granting a pension to Thomas Mooney; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7707) granting an increase of pension to John H. Morrison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7708) granting an increase of pension to Alexander Murphy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7709) granting a pension to Kelly Murphy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7710) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Odle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7711) granting a pension to Margaret E. Oursborn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7712) granting a pension to Phoebe F. Phillips; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7713) granting a pension to P. B. Pulley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7714) granting a pension to Rebecca Rapalyea; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7715) granting a pension to John W. Reid; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7716) granting an increase of pension to Elias Rippee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7717) granting an increase of pension to William H. H. Rose; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7718) granting a pension to James H. Rowden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7719) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Rowlett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7720) granting a pension to Elizabeth Saunders; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7721) granting an increase of pension to G. S. Scott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7722) granting a pension to Walter Skeen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7723) granting a pension to Henrietta C. Stanton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7724) granting a pension to Sophie Stephan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7725) granting an increase of pension to Josephine D. Steffins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7726) granting a pension to Thomas Stockton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7727) granting an increase of pension to W. H. H. Stout; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7728) granting an increase of pension to Jerry W. Tallman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7729) granting a pension to Augustus Thompson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7730) granting a pension to Lauson Thompson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7731) granting a pension to Fred Trilsch; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7732) granting a pension to Joseph Turnbough; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7733) granting an increase of pension to Eliza E. Tuttle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7734) for the relief of John Upton; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7735) granting an increase of pension to Aaron Walker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7736) granting an increase of pension to Mary Westerfield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7737) granting a pension to Samuel Whitsett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7738) granting a pension to Abner Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7739) granting a pension to Nicholas J. Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7740) for the relief of Erhard Woener; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7741) granting a pension to W. Woolsey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUSSELL: A bill (H. R. 7742) granting a pension to James McGeehee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7743) granting a pension to Mary Mackey Applegate; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7744) granting a pension to William H. Strothkamp; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7745) granting an increase of pension to James Uzzle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEENERSON: A bill (H. R. 7746) granting an increase of pension to James M. Howes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: A bill (H. R. 7747) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Paup; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7748) for the relief of A. E. Wagstaff; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TAVENNER: A bill (H. R. 7749) granting a pension to Andrew J. Leonard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TREADWAY: A bill (H. R. 7750) granting a pension to Clara E. Brass; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON: Papers to accompany bill granting a pension to Thomas O'Reilly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill granting an increase of pension to Victoria Capan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DALE: Petition of the National Liquor League of the United States at Chicago, Ill., protesting against an appropriation to pay the expenses of delegates to the Anti-Saloon League convention at Milan, Italy; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of the Association of German Authors of America, protesting against a duty on books printed in foreign languages; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DYER: Petition of the St. Louis Branch of the Railway Mail Association, favoring admission in time of peace of railway postal clerks in the service of the United States to the Army and Navy Hospital; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the United Commercial Travelers of America at Carthage, Mo., favoring 1-cent letter postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the National Liquor League of the United States at Chicago, Ill., and the Missouri State Liquor Dealers' Association, protesting against the payment of the expenses of Anti-Saloon League delegates to their convention at Milan, Italy; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania: Petition of the Association of German Authors of America, protesting against the duty on books in foreign languages; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEE of Pennsylvania: Petition of the Association of German Authors of America, protesting against the proposed import tax on books printed in a language other than English; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEWIS of Pennsylvania: Papers to accompany bill granting a pension to Sarah A. Hamersly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MANN: Petitions of sundry citizens of Chicago, protesting against a tax on books printed in foreign languages; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARTIN: Papers to accompany bill granting an increase of pension to Harvey Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill granting an increase of pension to Jones Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REILLY of Connecticut: Petition of Housatonic Valley Pomona Grange, No. 10, South Kent, Conn., favoring the administration policy in regard to an enlarged parcel post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SABATH: Petition of the Association of German Authors of America, New York, N. Y., protesting against the proposed import tax on books printed in a language other than English; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCULLY: Petition of the Association of German Authors of America, protesting against a duty on books printed in foreign languages; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the German-American Alliance of Middlesex Branch, N. J., protesting against a duty on books published in foreign languages; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: Petition of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, of Los Angeles, Cal., favoring a strong Navy for the United States; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIS: Petition of the Association of German Authors of America, protesting against a duty on books printed in foreign languages; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILSON of New York: Petition of the Association of German Authors of America, protesting against the proposed duty on books printed in foreign languages; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota: Petition of the North Dakota State Retail Jewelers' Association, favoring the passage of legislation respecting the sale of watches; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE.

SATURDAY, August 23, 1913.

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I present a resolution adopted by the Legislature of Texas relative to the marketing of farm products. I ask that the resolution may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas there are thousands of dollars lost to the farmers of Texas every year through inadequate marketing facilities and imperfect knowledge in regard to the same; and
Whereas every farmers' organization in Texas has declared in favor of State and Federal aid to better marketing conditions; and
Whereas this legislature in the present session has appropriated \$15,000 to be used in gathering and distributing information in regard to more efficient methods of marketing farm crops: Therefore be it